

73
A
LIFE IS LITURGIES

PRAYER BOOK REVISION IN
THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH FOCUSING ON
THE PROPOSAL OF 1971 - THE HOLY EUCHARIST

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of the
School of Theology at Claremont

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Religion

by
Sione Halapua
June 1973

PERMISSION TO COPY
MUST BE OBTAINED
FROM AUTHOR.

This dissertation, written by

Sione Halapua

*under the direction of his Faculty Committee,
and approved by its members, has been presented
to and accepted by the Faculty of the School of
Theology at Claremont in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of*

DOCTOR OF RELIGION

Faculty Committee

Patricia Martin Doyle

Raymond

Date

June 1973

E. Thomas Trotter

INTRODUCTION

This dissertation is concerned with the processes by which the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America expresses its liturgies. The focus of this paper is on '*Services for Trial Use*' especially '*The Holy Eucharist*,' the 1971 Proposal. This period of trial use starting from 1971, will be over in the fall of 1973.

The 1971 Proposal itself, is looked at from the perspective of historical studies and theological, pastoral, and congregational concerns. This is taken into account by "The Standing Liturgical Commission" in the liturgies they have proposed.

The term 'Life' as in the title is assumed as a process--a process by which the Episcopal Church shares and interacts with its members. Liturgy means here, a service--written words and actions in fixed form or order in the Episcopal Church for its public worship. The Episcopal Church is also known as the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, which is one of the members of the family in Christendom known as the Anglican Church, or the Anglican Communion. The word Anglican is here used to describe those churches that derived from the Church of England and its expansion overseas and which share in the common traditions of faith, church order and liturgies that are distinctly theirs.

The technical liturgical terminologies are discussed and defined in the Glossary.

All acknowledgments are gratefully made to St. Mark's Episcopal

Church, Altadena, California for the support which I have been receiving and making it possible for me to make this study as a reality. I am deeply indebted to my wife, Anne, and other helpers (Jean Rostad, Mary Kisting, and Jo Gerpheide) for the effort of trying to read my handwriting while typing preliminary drafts.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	iii
CHAPTER	
I. BACKGROUND OF PRAYER BOOK REVISION	1
Heritage from the Church of England	1
The First American Prayer Book	15
The Revision of 1892 Prayer Book	19
The Last Revision of 1928 Prayer Book	21
II. PROPOSALS FOR THE REVISION	26
1953's Prayer Book Studies IV: The Eucharistic Liturgy	26
1967's Prayer Book Studies XVII: The Liturgy of the Lord's Supper	33
1971's Prayer Book Studies 21: The Holy Eucharist	37
III. AN OVERVIEW OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST	46
The Proclamation of the Word of God	47
The Celebration of the Holy Communion	54
IV. THEOLOGICAL EVALUATION	62
The Last Supper - Holy Eucharist?	62
Translation	63
Exegesis	66

CHAPTER	PAGE
Notes and Comments on Mark 14:22-25 with its Parallels	67
Interpretation	77
 V. EVALUATION IN LIGHT OF CONTEMPORARY ISSUES	82
Interaction	82
Culture	84
Sex	87
Language	93
Ecumenism	98
 VI. CONCLUSION	111
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	112
 GLOSSARY	120

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND OF PRAYER BOOK REVISION

HERITAGE FROM THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

The background of Prayer Book Revision in

The History of the Protestant Episcopal Church as a self-governing member of the Anglican Communion begins with its organization as a Church independent of the Mother Church of England during the years immediately following the American Revolution. But the history of its whole life stretches back for many years before that. Roughly three hundred and fifty years have elapsed since the first Anglican parishes were formed in the English settlements along the American coast . . . that time the Anglican Church in America was a collection of overseas parishes that were part of the Church of England.¹

The chief external bond then was the English Prayer Book of 1662, which was the Fifth Prayer Book Revision from that 1549--the First English Prayer Book.

England could not remain unaware of liturgical reforms on the continent and the latter years of the reign of Henry VIII saw the demand for some reform of the services of the English Church. During 1548 experiments were made, especially of saying Latin Mass in English and of reducing the members of Breviary Offices to two, Mattins and Evensong. The net result of these experiments was probably to assemble all of the materials necessary for an English Prayer Book. All that remained was to publish the book and impose it on the English Church.

¹Mills Dawley Powel, *The Episcopal Church and Its Work* (Greenwich, Conn.: Seabury Press, 1955), p. 23.

The names of the authors and the process of compilation of the First English Prayer Book (1549) are obscure. The only ascertainable details are (a) In September 1548 hints are given in a letter from the Lord Protector to the University of Cambridge and in a royal proclamation that the settlement of liturgical question and the drawing up of a uniform order of prayer are desirable and that a committee is working on the matter.

According to a proclamation of September 23, 1548, the King is 'minding to see very shortly one uniform order throughout the realm,' 'for which cause at this time certain bishops and notable learned men, by his highness' commandment are congregate.'²

(b) This committee (six bishops and six other divines under the Archbishop Cranmer's chairmanship) representing both reformers and conservatives, met in September. All agreed on the desirability of services in English. The committee was not author of the book; its function was to discuss, criticise and amend a book already drawn up by "Cranmer with whatever assistance."³ (c) The resulting book was submitted to a meeting of the bishops in October or November and assented to in general.

On December 14 the Bill embodying the book was read in the Lords and a four-day debate on the Mass and the book followed. It reached the Commons on December 19. The Lords passed the third reading on January 15 (12 bishops for, and 9 against). The Bill (Act of

² W. K. Lowther Clarke, *Liturgy and Worship* (London: S.P.C.K., 1947), p. 154.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 155.

Uniformity) finally passed both Houses on January 21, a week before the end of the second year of Edward VI's reign and received royal assent on March 14. It required that the book should be used exclusively from Whitsunday, June 9, at the latest and imposed severe penalties for failure to do so.

Was it ever submitted to Convocation? There is no known record that it was; the (meager) Convocation records of the time perished in the Great Fire of 1666. "It is generally agreed that the First Prayer Book of Edward VI was not even submitted to Convocation but came out from the King in parliament."⁴

The aims of the compilers were stated in the Preface of the Book. . . .

There was never any thing by the wit of man so well devised, or so surely established which (on contināce of time) hath not been corrupted: as (among other things) it may plainly appere by the common prayers in the churche, commonly called divine service: the firste original and grounde whereof, if a manne woulde searche out by the auncient fathers, he shall finde that the same was not ordeyned, but of a good purpose, and for a great advancement of godliness: For they so ordered the matter, that all the whole Bible (or the greatest parte thereof) should be read over once in the yeare, intendyng thereby, that the Cleargie, and specially suche as were Ministers of the congregacion, should (by often readyng and meditation of Gods worde) be stirred up to godliness themselves, and be more able also to exhorte other by wholesome doctrine, and to confute them that were adversaries to the truth. And further, that the people (by daily hearyng of holy scripture read in the churche) should continuallye profite more and more in the knowledge of God, and bee the more inflamed with the love of his true religion.⁵

⁴ Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (Westminster: Dacre Press, 1949), p. 681.

⁵ *The Books of the Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments* (London, 1549), p. 3.

A national use, with everything English, with all complexities removed and with emphasis on the reading of the Bible (and the Bible only and recitation of the Psalms) with a minimum of interruption, that was the ideal. The writings of the Fathers, English Reformation formularies, German Church Orders, Quiñones' revised Breviary, Eastern liturgies, Gallican rites and various uses of the medieval Roman Rite all made contributions to the First Book of Common Prayer.

Yet the Communion Service of "The Supper of the Lorde and Holy Communion, commonly called the Masse"⁶ in 1549 was basically an English version of the Sarum Mass (the medieval liturgical use of Salisbury), not a new composition. The whole order and structure of the familiar public liturgy was preserved. The outstanding choral features were retained; not only the fixed Kyries, Gloria, Creed, Sanctus, Benedictus, and Agnus Dei, but the variable Introit, Offertory, and Communion Anthems in simplified form. Only the Gradual Anthem disappeared, presumably because Cranmer could devise no ready simplification for the seasonal complexities of Gradual, Tract, Alleluia, and Sequence at this point.

The chain of eleven short prayers of the Latin Canon, comprising supplications of a General Intercession interpolated into and curiously entwined with the central prayers of the eucharistic action were arranged into two consistent and continuous passages; first, an Intercession for both the Living and the Departed (themes which the

⁶*Ibid.*, p. 2.

Latin Rite divides, before and after the Consecration), and second, a complete Consecration Prayer after the model of the Eastern liturgies. All this matter was rewritten with a free hand.⁷ The only omissions of the slightest consequence were the name of the Pope, and two mutually supplementary lists of Saints, which were vestiges of the old Diptychs.⁸ During and after the Communion is sung or said one of a series of verses from the New Testament, "called the post-communion." This finished, there follows the Post-communion proper--a fixed prayer of thanksgiving. The whole Mass concludes with a Blessing.

The 1549 Prayer Book was not well received. The novel idea of enforcing a service book by a set of penalties shows that trouble was expected. It soon came. Such a moderate book would not satisfy the extreme reformers though they hastened to use it. Nor could it be anything but unwelcome to the conservatives, especially in country districts out of touch with recent trends of thought. Discontent with the government over other matters aggravated the trouble. The most serious outbreak occurred in the west of England. The insurgents demanded restoration of the Latin services, Reservation, Communion in one kind, recall of the English Bible ("as tending to encourage heresy") and the restoration of the old ceremonies. They asserted that the New Book was imposed by a secular body whereas doctrine depended on the ascent of Christendom. The rising was put down sternly; this acted

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 280-283.

⁸ *Dix, op. cit.*, pp. 498-511.

as a deterrent on the disaffected in other parts.

Yet there was still opposition . . . and in high places: Princess Mary, Bishop Bonner and the Universities. A Royal Visitation was planned to enforce the use of the Book and to do away with old ceremonies that had been carried over to the new services, even some that the Book allowed, e.g., oil, chrism, altars. To prevent a return to the old use, Latin Service Books were called in to be burned.

The First Prayer Book was acceptable neither to the conservatives who disliked the changes, nor to the reform party, for whom it did not go far enough. For the time being both used it, putting their own interpretation, doctrinal and ceremonial on it. Possibly with the familiarity of use it would have come to satisfy most Englishmen. Whether Cranmer "regarded it as a temporary compromise and only waited for further innovations"⁹ or not, it is certainly true that more extreme men, e.g., Ridley, Bishop of London, were soon going beyond the requirements of the Book. Two factors gave the extreme reformers the advantage, viz., the support of continental Protestants such as Bucer and Peter Martyr who were persistent in adverse criticism of the Book.

Meanwhile the opinions of continental reformers began to carry more weight now that Peter Martyr and Bucer occupied chairs of divinity at English universities. Cranmer sought their view on the Prayer Book, apparently with the idea of revising it soon. Bucer wrote a book, the

⁹ Clarke, *op. cit.*, p. 171.

'Censura,' on the subject. He had much to commend but also much to condemn, e.g., at Holy Communion, vestments, use of gestures such as crossing, the ("superstitious") notion of consecration, words of Institution, manual acts, epiclesis, presence of non-communicants and the "half-mass when none have signified their intention of communicating."¹⁰

As with the First Prayer Book, the actual revision was done behind the scenes and it is impossible to say who were responsible. A conference which included Cranmer, Ridley and Peter Martyr was held that the Prayer Book might be "faithfully and godly pursued, explained and made fully perfect."¹¹

Parliament was out on January 24, 1552 and convocation the next day but Convocation decided nothing; the Upper House discussed certain points only e.g., words of distribution at Holy Communion; the Lower House deferred the matter. The Book was put before Parliament with the Second Act of Uniformity and debated for a month. The natural leaders of the opposition, Gardiner and Bonner, were in prison; the Bill was passed on April 14 and the Book was to come into use on All Saints' Day.

The influence of Bucer and Peter Martyr is obvious; many of their suggestions had been adopted and unfortunately some of the more drastic. Some of the changes were made, apparently, to deprive the moderates, such as Gardiner (with whom Cranmer had a long controversy over Eucharist doctrine), of those parts of the First Prayer Book that

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 173.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 174.

had reassured them. Some outstanding alterations were: In the Holy Communion, the title was altered to "The Lord's Supper or Holy Communion," introits were omitted, the Decalogue added and the Kyries adapted to it; the Canon was broken, in a way that obscured its character as one continuous act of memorial, into three parts, Prayer for Church Militant, Prayer of Consecration and Prayer of Oblation, with invitation, confession, absolution and prayer of humble access all before Consecration. Epiclesis, anamnesis, sign of the cross and commemoration of saints were omitted, the words of distribution were "Take and eat . . . etc.," Gloria in excelsis was moved to the post-communion.

On the death of Edward VI, July 1553, Mary came to the throne (1553-1558). She had always remained loyal to the Roman rite. The public opinion anticipated an immediate return to services in Latin. In fact, unauthorized zeal, outran legal action, and the Latin Mass was used in many places before it was authorized. Cranmer vigorously defended the English rite and asserted that the Roman was contrary to Scripture; for this he was put in the Tower (September 1553). Most prominent continental and some extreme English reformers left the country; many settled in Frankfort which became the chief scene of Prayer Book history for the next five years.

The reign of Elizabeth, 1558-1603, inherited a difficult position: Convocation was ultra-conservative, the people at large were more ready for reform than they had ever been. Elizabeth valued uniformity in worship so highly that she was prepared to sink her own

preferences and enforce a reasonable standard even if it involved forbidding public expression of religious opinions and the vigorous use of the Royal Supremacy in matters ecclesiastical. At first the Latin Mass remained, with epistle, Gospel, Lord's Prayer and Creed in English if desired. An informal committee, mainly returned exiles, was appointed to recommend a Book for the queen's approval. Practically nothing is known of its deliberations but it seems to have presented a book rather more Protestant than that of 1552. It disappeared and a second attempt, more moderate, was also rejected.

Meanwhile Convocation was showing itself pro-Roman. It defined its position in Five Articles, three affirming the traditional doctrine of the Eucharist, one affirming Papal Supremacy, and one denying lay authority in ecclesiastical matters. To resolve the tangle a Supremacy Act was passed in which the title "Supreme Governor" replaced that of "Supreme Head." Then a new Act of Uniformity with the government's Book attached was presented to Parliament. It passed the Commons readily enough but only scraped through the Lords: no bishops voted for it.

The Act claimed not to issue a new Book but to restore the Second Book of Edward VI with minor alterations, e.g., the "Words of Administration" from the First and Second Prayer Books were combined. The use of the new Book was made compulsory from June 24; the transition was very smooth. The queen's chapel led the way, the laity and rank-and-file clergy followed willingly. The bishops and some others were vigorous in protest, but in all only 200 clergy were deprived in

the next five years. Yet the Prayer Book soon became the battleground for both conservatives and reformers. Up to the time of the Pope's excommunication,¹² of the queen in 1570, there were constant objections and attempts at change from the conservative side. On the other hand "the extreme reforming party, and especially the returned exiles, would have none of it so far as the ceremonial regulations were concerned."¹³ Many Puritans (i.e., extreme reformers) left the church; others remained within it but refused to conform: they either ignored the directions of the Prayer Book or used unofficial Protestant versions of it.

On James I's accession the Puritans presented him with a petition setting out their grievances. As far as the Prayer Book was concerned they requested "that examination may go before Communion" and some Apocryphal readings were replaced by some passages from the Canon.

During the reign of Charles I (1625-1649), the Scottish bishops, in collaboration with Archbishop Laud, produced "The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Parts of Divine Service for the Use of the Church of Scotland." This was a dignified book closer to that of 1549 than that of 1604. Some of its characteristic points were: at Holy Communion the prayer for the King precedes

¹² Farnham E. Maynard, *The Continuity of the Church of England* (Melbourne: Fraser and Morphet Pty., 1939), p. 103.

¹³ Clarke, *op. cit.*, p. 184.

Collect for the Day; there is a commemoration of saints and an epiclesis, the manual acts are laid down, the prayer of oblation with anamnesis follow the Consecration, the prayer of Humble Access immediately precedes communion. The attempt to impose the book by royal authority failed but the compilers' work was not wasted: it rescued the 1549 type of liturgy from oblivion and the book had a notable influence on later books, Scottish, English, and American.

Charles II was welcomed back from exile in 1660. Previously, by the Declaration of Breda, he said that he would consent to any act of Parliament devised for that purpose. The Puritans petitioned the King against the use of the Book of Common Prayer. In a long address

they accepted the fulness of a liturgy provided that it be agreeable to the Word of God . . . neither too tedious in the whole nor composed of too short prayers, unmeet repetitions or responsals; not to be dissonant from the liturgies of other reformed churches; nor too rigorously imposed; provided also that the minister be allowed to use his own gifts of prayer.¹⁴

In October the King issued a Royal Declaration on Ecclesiastical Affairs undertaking to appoint a committee for the revision of the Prayer Book and dispensing the Puritan clergy from use of parts of the current book to which they objected. In March 1661 the committee was appointed. It consisted of twelve bishops and twelve Puritan divines (each with assessors). It was to review the Book of Common Prayer, compare it with ancient liturgies, consider objections against it and make "needful or expedient" alterations.

Convocation met in May and busied itself about special services.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 191.

Meanwhile the House of Commons, in no mood for concessions to dissenters, passed an Act of Uniformity with the Fourth Prayer Book (1604) attached and the Bill reached its second reading in the Lords. In November a revision committee, consisting of eight bishops was appointed and as the bishops had been working on the matter the book was soon before both Houses of Convocation where it was passed by 20th of December. Parliament debated the Acts of Uniformity at great length but the new Prayer Book was neither discussed nor amended by either Commons or Lords. It became law in May 1662 and was to be used exclusively from the following August 24.

According to the new Preface the objects of the revision were: the better direction of them that are to officiate, elucidation by removal of archaisms, explanation of what was ambiguous or liable to misconstruction and a more perfect rendering of Holy Scripture; and the provision of certain convenient addition.¹⁵

The revision was carefully made and oversights were few. Small regard was paid to Puritan objections because, as the bishops said, they "were either of dangerous consequence . . . or else of no consequence at all, but utterly frivolous and vain."¹⁶ Parliament went further and required Puritan ministers to use the new Book and to avow the unlawfulness of their previous conduct. Yet, it may be said that the revisers lost an opportunity; they lacked a clear sense of liturgical form. Among the defects of the Book are: the scattered condition of the Anaphora, especially the positions of the prayer of Humble

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 194.

¹⁶ *The Book of Common Prayer*. Church of England (1662). Preface.

Access, fraction and prayer of oblation, and the absence of anamnesis; long exhortations in the Liturgy.

By the beginning of the American Revolutionary War, not only in the colony of Virginia, but also in the other colonies, the Church of England was functioning . . . and the 1662 Book of Common Prayer the official book of worship.¹⁷

The Eucharist, the "Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion" in the 1662 book begins with the Lord's Prayer, the Collect for Purity, the Decalogue, a collect for the King, and the Collect for the Day. The "Priest" then read the Epistle and the Gospel (in the King James Version from 1662), after which the Nicene Creed is said. If there is no sermon, an authorized homily is to follow. The form of this Pro-Anaphora dates basically from 1552 Prayer Book. The priest initiates the offering with one or more scriptural sentences. The receiving of the alms of the parishioners is given a place at this point within the rite. The priest is then to "place upon the Table so much Bread and Wine, as he shall think convenient,"¹⁸ and then to say a prayer "for the whole state of Christ Church militant here in earth."¹⁹ The order of these elements is that of the books of 1552, 1559 and 1604, except that these books had not specified when the elements were to be placed upon the Table. Three exhortations are printed within the 1662 rite, one for use when giving notice of a celebration, one for use if the

¹⁷ John Wallace Suter, *The American Book of Common Prayer* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1949), p. 18.

¹⁸ *The Book of Common Prayer* (1662), p. 308.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 309.

people are "negligent to come,"²⁰ and a third for use at each celebration. The first and third of these are 1557 revisions of 1549 exhortations. The second, which came into the book in 1552, comes from writings²¹ of Peter Martyr. The Exhortations are followed by the Invitation, General Confession, Absolution, and Comfortable Words. The texts of these are basically those of the 1549 revision of the late 1548 'Order of the Communion,' which was principally derived from Hermann's Consultation.²²

Immediately after the Comfortable Words is the Sursum Corda, the Preface (with Proper Preface on five principal feast) and the Sanctus. Beginning with the 1552 book, the Prayer of Humble Access follows the Sanctus. The Prayer of Consecration consists of a petition (which contains some overtones of thanksgiving for the One Sacrifice) that the communicants "may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood," and the words of Institution. Since 1552 there has been no anamnesis or epiclesis. The Words of Administration for the Bread are

The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee,
preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life: take and eat
this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him
in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving,²³

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 311.

²¹ F. L. Cross, (ed.) *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (London: Oxford University Press, 1957), p. 1055.

²² F. E. Brightman, *The English Rite* (London: Rivingtons, 1915).

²³ *The Book of Common Prayer* (1662), p. 318.

and a similar sentence is provided for the Wine. The first half (an expansion of a medieval form typical of German Church Orders²⁴) had been provided in the 1549 book. The 1552 book substituted the second half. The two halves were combined at the time of Elizabethan Settlements. The Administration of the Communion is followed by the Lord's Prayer, one or the other of two prayers, the Gloria in excelsis and the blessing. The "Manual Acts" associated with the Prayer of Consecration, the titles for the various prayers, the provisions for the consecration of additional Elements, and the regulations concerning ablutions had been added in 1662.

THE FIRST AMERICAN PRAYER BOOK

The American Revolution and the independence of the States made some revision of the 1662 English Prayer Book for American use inevitable. On

July 4th, 1776, there were church congregations in all the states. But there were no bishops whatever; and there was no representative body. Now that the colonies were independent it was necessary that the church should be properly organized; a meeting was therefore called in New York at which eight states were represented, and it was agreed to call a general convention for the following year in Philadelphia. Meanwhile the Anglican Church in Connecticut had chosen Dr. Samuel Seabury as the first American Protestant Bishop; he sailed to England, and, failing to obtain consecration there, he went to Scotland where he was duly consecrated by three Scottish Bishops, and returned as Bishop of Connecticut in the August of 1785.²⁵

²⁴ Hermann von Wied, *Consultatie*, 1543. Martin Luther, *Deutsche Messe*, 1526.

²⁵ Percy Dearmer, *The Story of The Prayer Book* (London: Oxford University Press, 1933), p. 136.

The possibility of a revision which would find general acceptance was complicated not only by liturgical and theological issues but also by political enmities and personal animosities. As the only hope of unity seemed to lie in making only those changes necessitated by political independence, the first interstate convention adopted this stance as a "fundamental principle," but in September, 1785, a committee which was appointed by Seabury and on which he served prepared proposals for revision along Latitudinarian lines and sent these on to Boston for a convention from other New England states. That convention added to these proposals and sent them on to Philadelphia for a convention of the states south of New England. The Philadelphia convention of 1785 also received proposals for revision from a Virginia state convention and from a number of individuals, so it set aside the "fundamental principle" and authorized a revision for trial use of this

'Proposed Book'; but some of the proposals, which included the omission of the Nicene Creed and the Athanasian Canticle (and the omission of 'He descended into hell'), were too drastic and were rejected in each of the states. Bishop Seabury strongly resisted the Proposal Book, and urged that revision should be delayed until more bishops had been consecrated.²⁶

Seabury, finding it politically expedient to do so in a diocese dominated by liturgically and politically reactionary Tories, did an about face and set himself against the Proposed Book. The use of the book (which came off the press in April, 1786) was authorized in all the states represented at Philadelphia except New Jersey and in the New England States except for Connecticut, and it served as the basis

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 137.

for the book which was authorized in 1789.

And he (Seabury) took the momentous step, in accordance with a 'concordat' he had made with his Scottish consecrators, of recommending a new Communion Service similar to that of the Scottish Non-Jurors. . . . The English archbishops now helped; and in 1787 Dr. William White was consecrated in Lambeth Chapel as Bishop of Pennsylvania, with Dr. Samuel Provost as Bishop of New York. A second general convention met in Philadelphia in 1789, with three bishops, and a house of clerical and lay deputies. As a result, the American Prayer Book was drawn up.²⁷

The revisors of 1789 Prayer Book used the Proposed Book of 1786 as their basis, returning to the 1662 English Book at certain points, adopting some proposals from state conventions, going back again to "Free and Candid Disquisitions,"²⁸ "The Expediency and Necessity of Revising and Improving the Public Liturgy"²⁹ (both of which had contributed to the 1786 Proposed Book), and incorporating other ideas from Jeremy Taylor's writings,³⁰ that expressed Anglican spirituality in their balanced sobriety and their insistence on a well-ordered piety which stressed temperance and moderation in all things; also from Bishop Edmund Gibson's writings,³¹ and from a manuscript notebook of Seabury's, in which he had inscribed various forms from

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ A collection of anonymous essays by different authors, edited anonymously by John Jones, a Latitudinarian of Alconbury and published in 1749.

²⁹ Another anonymous 1749 publication, to which was appended a proposed 'A New Liturgy,' among those of Latitudinarian sympathies. A number of sentiment of proposed revisions and arguments were published.

³⁰ John Taylor, *The Rule and Exercise of Holy Dying*, 1651.

³¹ N. Sykes, and Edmund Gibson, *A Study in Politics and Religion in the Eighteenth Century*, 1926.

sources as diverse as the writings of Bishop Wilson of Sodor and Man,³² the Scottish Communion Office, and the King's Chapel liturgy.

General Convention met in 1789 and dealt with the Prayer Book. All references to English political conditions were omitted and prayers for the President and for Congress were inserted. The Athanasian Creed was omitted. Many minor changes were made. The chief ones with possible doctrinal implications were, in the Communion Service, the Scottish form of Consecration Prayer, which went back to that of 1549, was adopted substantially without opposition; it had already been incorporated in an Order of Communion put out by Seabury for Connecticut in 1786.

Errors having crept into 1789 Prayer Book, either by accident or design, the General Convention of 1792 created a Joint Committee to examine the printed Book by the original acts of the 1789 Convention and to prepare a mode for authenticating the book by some certain standard, and of publishing future editions of the same in the churches in the different states.

During the convention a resolution was introduced calling for the establishment of a committee with power to obtain a copyright on behalf of the General Convention, to grant the right to publish the Book, and to correct errors according to some standard book. All of this indicates that neither a standard book nor a standard edition

³² Thomas Wilson, *Principles and Duties of Christianity* (projected 1699, first painted 1707; the Manx Catechism) was the first book painted in Manx.

existed.

The 1801 General Convention, which met in Trenton, New Jersey, enacted legislation seeking to standardize the text of the Book of Common Prayer and to regulate its publication so that the editions published should agree with the text set forth by the church in General Convention.³³ In 1892, the Second American Prayer Book appeared.

THE REVISION OF 1892 PRAYER BOOK

During much of the nineteenth century, it appears that the American church developed a stronger interest in the Prayer Book, and greater actual uniformity in its ritual use. To a large degree, this was the result of the great energies which Bishop Hobart of New York threw into the importance of the church's worship as set forth in the Prayer Book, as the carrier of the church's faith, and as the great integrating factor among all the divergent opinions and the varied objectives of its members. The line of Hobart's plan of a genuine liturgical basis of doctrine was to take the Prayer Book seriously--to believe that the Church meant what it said when it talked to God.

'Prayer Book Churchmanship' became the aim and claim of every party, vying with each other in their protestations of loyalty to that standard, and in their assertions that their own position best set forth its meaning and power. But the defect of 'Prayer Book Churchmanship' then had been that with many it had a tendency to

³³ *The Book of Common Prayer*. Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. Ratification Convention of 1801, Canon III, p. 208.

degenerate into a conservative complacency with 'our incomparable liturgy,' to debase the ideal of uniformity into a fettish, and to set its face against even reasonable improvements.

This was the chief obstacle to Dr. William Huntington's valiant efforts for the revision of the Prayer Book in the latter part of the century. In the controversies over ceremonial in the 1860's and '70's, both sides had appealed to the text of the liturgy as a fixed and final authority. Those controversies were of such recent and poignant memory that Dr. Huntington felt constrained to assure the General Convention of 1880 "that in case such permission to launch a movement in favour of revision as was asked for was granted, no attempt would be made seriously to change the Liturgy proper, namely, the Office of the Holy Communion."³⁴ Accordingly, the amendments to this service actually adopted in the Prayer Book of 1892 were very few.

The majority of the changes, including all those that involved any alteration in the actual text, are identical with proposals in the Scottish Draft Liturgy of 1889. Their adoption is to be attributed to the initiative of Dr. Samuel Hart, whose activity on the Revision Commission was second only to that of Dr. Huntington and who, as a Connecticut churchman, had kept in close touch with the current developments in the Scottish Church, e.g., the initial Lord's Prayer was shorn of the Doxology which had been appended to it in 1789. The 'Summary of the Law,' which in 1789 had been presented as only an

³⁴ W. R. Huntington, *A Short History of the Book of Common Prayer* (New York: Whittaker, 1893), p. 135.

optional addition to the Decalogue, was now allowed as a substitute for it, except at one service each Sunday. The 'Lesser Litany' of Kyrie eleison was now inserted after the 'Summary.' This feature of 1549 had been restored in the Nonjurors' rite of 1718, but in an anomalous place, before the initial Lord's Prayer. The Draft of 1889 first proposed it for this place. The second and third Exhortations, comprising the little used 'Warning' of a future celebration of the Communion were relegated to the end of the service. Five new Offertory Sentences were incorporated from 1889. The Sanctus was detached from the end of the Preface to form a paragraph of its own.

The other alterations of 1892, which were not indebted to the Scottish Draft of 1889 were these: the 'Long Exhortation' was now required only once a month. The text of the Nicene Creed was printed in the Communion Service. The Apostles' Creed (though not printed here) could still be substituted for, as before. The then recent controversies over ceremonial left just one trace, in a new rubric stipulating that "sufficient opportunity shall be given to those present to communicate." This was designed to ban any celebrators at which the clergy did not permit any communions.

THE LAST REVISION OF 1928 PRAYER BOOK

The extreme conservatism which took alarm at any serious change in the Eucharist Liturgy in the Revision of 1892, and which limited improvements adopted then to a very scanty list, by that very fact left over a considerable amount of "unfinished business" in the form of

unsatisfied demands. Less than 25 years later, there was an insistent call for a further revision.

The experience in the use of the considerably altered Communion Service in the Prayer Book of 1892 had shown that the idol of uniformity could be thrown down, and a very fair amount of variety and flexibility introduced into the service, without the church's coming apart at the seams.

It is not surprising that the devotional life of the church outgrew the formularies and a situation resembling that found in England arose. So in 1913 a Commission was appointed to consider and report on 'revision and enrichment of the Prayer Book,' with the stipulation 'that no proposition involving the Faith and Doctrine of the church be considered or reported.³⁵

Quite a list of alterations of the framework, the arrangement, and the incidental decorations of the rite were approved; but the Commission was very chary of proposing any real changes in the basic text of the service.

By far the most important source of the amendment adopted in the American Prayer Book of 1928 was the attempt to revise the Prayer Book of the Church of England, which had been initiated in 1906, completed and passed by the Convocations in 1920, then renegotiated before the new Church Assembly for eight more years, until it wound up with the equivocal situation of having been accepted by the church but rejected by Parliament, in 1928. The thorough and far-reaching proposals of this book received extensive consideration by the American revisors.

³⁵ Clarke, *op. cit.*, p. 795.

The year 1928 marked the first time any American revision went back to the First English Prayer Book of 1549, and even to earlier Latin origins, for restorations of desirable features which had not been included in the Scottish revision of 1637. The breaking up of the long and heavy Prayer, for the 'whole state of Christ's church' into the short paragraphs of its constituent units of thought was one of the revisions. The American revision pioneered in permitting a Hymn or Anthem between the Epistle and Gospel in the Communion Service --the place where Cranmer had not found it practicable for him to follow the Sarum provisions for a Gradual Anthem or Sequence Hymn. The revisors also allowed the insertion of the Bidding Prayer, after the Creed. It was Sarum use to have this interesting variant of the General Intercession in the vernacular at the principal Mass on Sundays.

Since the 1928 Prayer Book, cancelled the bracket, ("or, the portion of Scripture appointed for the Epistle,") upon which the Puritan had insisted in 1661, the first lection of the liturgy was from some other portion of the Bible besides the actual 'Letters' of the Apostles. All save the American, however, say "The Lesson" instead of "The Epistle" in such case. In connection with Intercession for the Departed to the Prayer for the Church the American 1928 Prayer Book contained no actual objection to "prayers for the dead." The Prayer of Humble Access in the American rite followed 1637 Scottish Prayer Book exactly with the Lord's Prayer only between the Consecration and the Communion.

Other features of last revision which seem to have been drawn

from the revision which was going on in the same period in England are e.g., the Decalogue is now required at only one Sunday service in each Sunday; the 'Summary' being available as an alternative at any other time; this Liturgy is the only service at which the Prayer Book has ordered a Sermon, or even assigned a place for one within the Service; the 'Long Exhortation,' required once a month in American Prayer Book of 1892, is now demanded only on the first Sunday in the seasons of Advent, Lent and Trinity Sunday.

Though the American revisors paid the uttermost deference to the two "Mother Churches," in England and Scotland, and they were eager to avail themselves of the great stores of devotional learning in both countries, but they were not content to follow their lead slavishly in all particulars and considered each question which they raised upon its own merits, and decided upon it according to their own judgment e.g., the Intercession for the Departed³⁶; the restorations of the Sarum Proper Preface of the Nativity, a Hymn or Anthem for the Gradual and the Bidding Prayer.

Other instances where the American revisors were thinking on independent lines, and made definite new departures are these: the permission to insert special intercessory Collects after the Creeds; three entirely new Offertory Sentences³⁷ were added. All passages of Scripture are taken from the Revised Version.

³⁶ *The Book of Common Prayer.* Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. (1928), p. 74.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 73.

In short, the three most important American Books of Common Prayer are those of 1789, 1892, and 1928. The 1789 Book grew out of not only the 1662, 1552 and 1549 Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England, but also the 1637 Scottish liturgy. The Bishop Seabury Communion Service, which moulded the liturgical shape of the 1928 Communion service, was derived from the Scottish liturgy of 1764 and earlier liturgies.

The 1928 revision brought new flexibility and new material. A wide range of permissive Scripture readings and use of the Psalms made possible a more enlightening and inspiring worship. The various permissives for shortening the services increase the sustained interest of the worshipper. If these are wisely used by the officiant, they may contribute to greater devotion and richer spiritual growth; if they are unwisely used they contribute to spiritual impoverishment.³⁸

³⁸ Suter, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

CHAPTER II

PROPOSALS FOR THE REVISION

1953's PRAYER BOOK STUDIES IV: The Eucharistic Liturgy

After the 1928 revision, the General Convention (1928) transformed the 'Joint Commission,' created in 1913 to produce the revision, into a "Standing Liturgical Commission" of Bishops, presbyters and laymen. This was set up to consider all proposals for Prayer Book revision and to collate materials and to take note of new liturgical developments. Also, the Commission's task was to spearhead a continuing study of liturgy and worship, to act as a clearinghouse for suggestions and memorials on Prayer Book revision made to General Convention by dioceses, groups and individuals, and to publish the fruits of its study for the review and edification of the church.

The Commission began to publish its findings in a series of seventeen "Prayer Book Studies" since 1950. The Standing Liturgical Commission was required that of its nine members two Bishops be appointed by the Chairman of the House of Bishops, two presbyters and two laymen be appointed by the Chairman of the House of (clerical and lay) Deputies. The Custodian of the Book of Common Prayer was (is) to be an ex officio member, and the present Commission composed of a variety of churchmen.

In 1953, the Commission issued a revised liturgy. The proposals, history and rationale which aimed at stimulating discussion

and alternately creating a climate within which major Prayer Book revision could take place, are given explicitly in the Eucharistic Liturgy (Prayer Book Studies, IV).¹ In Prayer Book Studies IV, the Commission put forward the first major revision of the Holy Communion in the American Episcopal Church's history.

The first reason for the revision was "insufficiency of the Last Revision."² Since the First American Prayer Book of 1789, it was felt that a certain complacency in the superior advancement of the liturgy in comparison with the "frozen" English Prayer Book of 1662. This was disposed to congratulate on its various American improvements. To the Scottish heritage, which had given advantages in 1892 and 1928, it had shown "further betterments from that source--but rather conservative withal; we (Episcopalians) did not really believe that our rite needed any alterations in its basic text, though it might gain by minor rearrangements and added detail."³

The second reason for revising the Eucharistic Liturgy was "The Breakdown of Uniformity."⁴ The various kinds of ritual disobedience (e.g., many clergy all over the church ignored the rubrics requiring the reading of the "long Exhortation"⁵ thrice a year and

¹ *The Eucharistic Liturgy* (New York: Church Pension Fund, 1953).

² *Ibid.*, p. 134.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 135.

⁵ *The Book of Common Prayer*. Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. (1928), pp. 85-86.

the Decalogue at one celebration a month; omitting the Great Intercession,⁶ and eliminating the Gloria in Excelsis, communion devotions of Invitation, Confession, Absolution, Comfortable Words, Humble Access⁷) were no doubt serious enough the breakdown of some degree of uniformity in the Communion Service.

The third reason for revision was the principle of flexibility.

Our present (1928) liturgy makes a good deal of use of the principle of flexibility, noting normal constituents of the service which may be omitted, and other features which may be added, at the discretion of the officiant, who may lawfully mould the rite to his particular requirements without breaking its pattern. Much of the ritual disobedience which now threatens our unity is really a demand for the extension of this principle, with further rubrical provisions to meet needs which are acutely felt.⁸

The fourth reason for revision was "The Balance of Doctrine."⁹

The basic work of the Liturgical Commission towards the revision of the Eucharistic Liturgy was reflected and followed from: "most invaluable part of that blessed 'liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free,' that in his worship different forms and usages may without offence be allowed, provided the substance of the Faith be kept entire."¹⁰

The fifth reason for revision was "The general title of the

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 74-75.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 76-82.

⁸ *The Eucharistic Liturgy*, p. 138.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 139.

¹⁰ *The Book of Common Prayer*. Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. (1789), Preface.

service ought to be clearly expressive of its distinctive character and content; it should be inclusive of the particular emphasis given it in the church, and present those emphases in an impartially balanced form; and it should furnish a convenient term of reference by which to speak of it in uncontroversial connections."¹¹ The title of 1928 has remained unchanged since it was adopted in 1552: "The Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion." It has some distinct shortcomings, e.g., 'The Order for,'

is an inconvenience to liturgical student, one of whose first tasks is to learn to discriminate between an 'Order,' which sets forth a structural plan of a service which may vary in nearly all its constituent parts and a developed 'Liturgy,' which prescribes a fixed text . . . the phrase is accurate for Morning Prayer, but it does not apply to the Liturgy.¹²

'The Lord's Supper' and 'The Holy Communion' justified the same benefits as the Apostles at the Last Supper,¹³ is a source of confusion in a title. The term, 'The Holy Communion' applies to the actual reception of the Sacrament, or to the part of the service in which that Sacrament is administered. The 'Holy Communion' is something which is administered and received, rather than something which is celebrated. The Liturgical Commission proposed 'The Eucharistic Liturgy' as a new title for a revised liturgy in 1953. The word 'Eucharistic' expresses the content of the rite, which has its roots

¹¹ *The Eucharistic Liturgy*, p. 141.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 145.

¹³ Mark 14:22-25, with its parallels Luke 22:15-21; Matthew 26:26-29, I Corinthians 11:23-25.

in numerous texts¹⁴ of the New Testament. The 'Liturgy' is a specific, esteemed and impartial term for the form of the Service. It is neutral in its implications, since its original and etymological meaning is 'Public Service.'

The sixth need for revision was the major subtitles of the Communion Service, e.g., *the Introduction, the Ministry of the Word, the Offertory, the Intercession, the Preparation, the Consecration, the Communion of Priest and People and The Thanksgiving*. The Commission

have come to the conclusion that . . . it is too detailed to give a lucid idea of the main movements of the service; and at the same time it is not detailed enough to give names to all the constituents which it is desirable to designate.¹⁵

So they (Standing Liturgical Commission) proposed four chief movements:

- I. The Ministry of the Word, from the beginning through the Lectio, Creed and Sermon.
- II. The Offertory, comprising the Offertory, Intercession, and penitential preparation for the Communion.
- III. The Consecration, from the Sursum Corda through the Lord's Prayer.
- IV. The Holy Communion, to the end of the service.¹⁶

Within this general framework, a number of sign changes, e.g.,

¹⁴ Matthew 26:27; Mark 14:23; Luke 23:17, 19; I Corinthians 11:24, 14:17; Philippians 4:6; I Timothy 2:1.

¹⁵ *The Eucharistic Liturgy*, p. 148.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 149.

the shaping of the Decalogue and long Exhortation into Special Service of Preparation for Communion, the moving of the Gloria in Excelsis to its 1549 position, the shortening of the Prayer for the Church, the shifting of the Absolution to after the Comfortable Words, the placing of the Fraction after the Prayer of Consecration and the Lord's Prayer, and the breaking up of the words of Administration into a Bidding to Communion containing the 1559 conflation followed by a short Administration sentence based on 1549. There were numerous changes in phraseology in reflecting a desire to bring Cranmer up to date. No longer was the burden of sins "intolerable," nor our Lord's death a satisfaction. The Prayer for the church contained a petition for the faithful departed to have "peace in the land of the living."¹⁷ The Kyries could be said or sung in Greek, and the Peace, Benedictus Qui Venit and Agnus Dei were added immediately before Communion, though only the Peace was required.

Reactions to 'The Eucharistic Liturgy. Prayer Book Studies, IV,' varied from extensive comment, cautious to violent criticism. "This was expected, in view of the primary importance of the subject, since the shape and character of the Eucharist are fundamental to any major liturgical revision."¹⁸ The Commission was accused of being too bound to Cranmer, of forsaking principle for acceptability, and of failing to question in a more radical way what ought to be the con-

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 329.

¹⁸ *The Liturgy of the Lord's Supper* (New York: Church Pension Fund, 1966), Preface III.

stituent parts of a eucharist which is genuinely Biblical, authentically primitive, and suited to the needs of the twentieth century.

It has not always been easy to evaluate objectively much of the material that has been received--to separate the comments based upon careful study and reasoned conviction from those that are due to judgements made either in haste or from long-standing preferences and prejudices. For one thing, the Commission could seldom judge whether the persons who presented the proposals to the group reporting were in sympathy with the changes or not. Many reactions were obviously based upon preconceived, partisan positions. This was especially true of many clergymen who reported, and whose communications too often displayed unnecessary hostility and sarcasm.¹⁹

In all fairness to the Commissioners it should be pointed out that until 1964, it was impossible to approve any revision of the Prayer Book for Trial Use. This prevented the 1953 Liturgy from ever being viewed and heard within the context of worship. But in 1964 the General Convention amended the Church's Constitution in such a way as to introduce a new approach to Prayer Book revision. In 1961 the Liturgical Commission had introduced an amendment to Article X²⁰ of the Constitution, permitting extended trial use of proposed forms before action is taken for formal revision. This amendment was passed unanimously in both Houses of the Convention²¹ of 1961 and was finally ratified in 1964.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

²⁰ Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. General Convention. *Constitution and Canons*, 1789-1970, p. 9.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

1967's PRAYER BOOK STUDIES XVII: The Liturgy of the Lord's Supper

In the 1950's and '60's, the pace of liturgical revision was quickening both within and outside the Anglican Communion. The Lambeth Conference Report of 1958²² seemed to free Anglicanism from rigid loyalty to the historic Prayer Books of 1549, 1552 and 1662, and its suggested principles²³ for revision seem to have presented a weighty challenge to American revisors. After it appeared that the proposed liturgy of 1953 had failed to commend itself to the church, The Liturgical Commission went to work on another thoroughgoing revision.

Our proposals . . . are not a revision of the draft presented in Prayer Book Studies IV. They are essentially a fresh and independent approach to the problem of Eucharistic Worship. We believe the time is ripe for a more radical searching after the goal of an 'ideal' liturgy.²⁴

Despite rumblings here and there about the Standing Liturgical Commission's unilateral proposal to omit the *Filioque* from the Nicene Creed and the suggested omission of the entire Penitential Order, the vast majority of delegates to the General Convention at Seattle in September 1967 felt that the new rite ought to be given a fair trial.

The 'primitive features' of 'The Liturgy of the Lord's Supper' are justified²⁵ by the Standing Liturgical Commission. They reflect

²² *The Lambeth Conference 1958* (London: S.P.C.K., 1958).

²³ Colin O. Buchanan (ed.) *Modern Anglican Liturgies, 1958-1968* (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), pp. 8-21.

²⁴ *The Liturgy of the Lord's Supper*, p. 13.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 18-57.

not only the Old and New Testament background, but also the Patristic and Reformation heritage of the rite, e.g., the optional restoration of an Old Testament Lesson; the placing of the Creed after the Sermon; the reversion to the plural "We believe" (πιστεύομεν . . .)²⁶; and the omission of the Filioque.²⁷ The Peace, located before the Intercession, is an enrichment from ancient sources; as is the recovery of the basic control sequence of the Service, Intercession--Offertory--Thanksgiving. The breaking of the Bread 'before the people' in a separate act following Consecration, re-expresses what Dom Gregory Dix²⁸ called the early fourfold shape of the Eucharist, while the Benedictus qui Venit as a Communion acclamation expressing Christ's coming to us at that time in the service and the 'Holy Things' (consecrated Bread and Wine) in the invitation to Communion echoes the τὰ ἀγια τοῦ ἀγιος of the Greek liturgies.²⁹ The service is concluded in the ancient manner of a dismissal.

The Prayer of Consecration itself retains the oblation which the American Episcopal Church has inherited from the Scottish 1764

²⁶ The Nicene Creed of 325.

²⁷ The dropping of the Filioque clause in the statement of the "possession of the Holy Spirit," is not done out of scruple or hesitancy, because of the long-standing controversy between the Eastern and Western Churches about the doctrinal validity of the "double possession" from the Father and the Son. It is simply a recognition of the fact that it was not originally in the Creed.

²⁸ Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (Westminster: Dacre Press, 1949).

²⁹ T. S. Garrett, *Christian Worship* (London: Oxford University Press, 1963), p. 81.

rite through its own revisions from 1790 onwards. This oblation affects the meaning of 'memorial.' On the one hand when 'memorial' is first mentioned in the Consecration Prayer, after the recital of the Mighty Works of God in creation and redemption, its purpose, as in Hippolytus,³⁰ is clearly to set forth before man the one sacrifice of Christ. But its next appearance in the anamnesis links it to an oblation of the gifts. Here its purpose would appear to be at the Memorial of Christ's Passion before the Father. The precise intent of the proposed rite at this crucial point is unclear. The doctrinal content of this memorial--and--oblation, would need more Biblical justification.

Another primitive feature of the proposed service is in the Invocation or epiclesis. Although the Standing Liturgical Commission disclaim any 'moment of consecration' and the tendency in rites stemming from the Scottish liturgy of 1764 to follow Eastern rites³¹ in which the epiclesis features as the moment of Consecration, will leave the impression that consecration occurs at the Invocation. Reasons adduced for the double Invocation of the Word and Holy Spirit are that the "Word no less than the Spirit is recreative in his function."³² Cranmer's 1549 "with thy holy spirite and words," coming before the Narrative, presumably referred to the Spirit's invigorating power, through the use of our Lord's Words of Institution, with the intent to

³⁰ F. L. Cross (ed.) *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (London: Oxford University Press, 1958), pp. 641-642.

³¹ Garrett, *op. cit.*, pp. 67-82.

³² *The Liturgy of the Lord's Supper*, pp. 47-48.

consecrate. But the Scottish 1764 Service adopted the Eastern position for the epiclesis. When the American Episcopal Church in 1790 altered the Scottish Invocation on the elements (from "that they may become . . ." to "that we receiving them . . .") the intent of the epiclesis became more obviously to bestow the benefits of communion than to consecrate. If the epiclesis is upon the communicants rather than the elements, then it would seem that the following phrase, "Fill with thy grace all who partake . . ." may well be redundant. It is unfortunate in this connection that there does not seem to be much re-evaluation of the whole concept of the sanctifying of "things"; although Massey Shepherd hints at it when he writes: "one might . . . argue that it is more important that the Spirit be invoked upon the church than upon the elements."³³

Some major concerns in 1967 in 'The Liturgy of the Lord's Supper' have been to increase the emphasis of joy, thanksgiving and of allowing maximum flexibility within a unified structure. Also there has been a growing desire to recapture the Lord's Supper as the central focus for the Episcopal Church's worship. The corporate has been accentuated over against the individualistic nature of the service. This corporate nature of the proposed eucharist is expressed in many ways. The laity have increased functions. They appear as lectors, leaders in prayer and bearers of oblations. They respond in the litany of the Intercession and say together the post-communion

³³ Massey Shepherd, Jr., *The Reform of Liturgical Worship* (New York: Seabury Press, 1961), p. 94.

thanksgiving. The corporate nature of the service has also been stressed by the heightening of the dramatic through the imagery of the offertory and the requirements for brief periods of silence before the Confession and after the Fraction.

The preliminary results of trial use indicated clearly there was within the church a considerable amount of suspicion about the purpose of Prayer Book revision. The suspicion expressed itself in some of the answers to the questionnaire designed by the Commission, in the Church Press, and in the vehemence of the language used by some correspondents in commenting on *The Liturgy of the Lord's Supper*.³⁴

The task of responding promptly to criticisms had been made by giving attention to variations and changes as were shown to be desirable through actual experience in trial use. The schedule of variations and substitutions proposed by the Drafting Committee on the Holy Eucharist, set up by the Standing Liturgical Commission under the Revision Plan approved by the Standing Liturgical Commission early in 1969, and was adopted by Special General Convention II at South Bend, Indiana, in September 1969.

1971's PRAYER BOOK STUDIES 21: The Holy Eucharist

There appeared to be general agreement about the structure of the outline of the service of 'The Liturgy of the Lord's Supper,' presented in Prayer Book Studies XVII, there was at the same time some disagreement about whether or not the language of 1928 ought to be altered; and if so, how far. Recognizing that no single liturgy can

³⁴ *The Holy Eucharist* (New York: Church Hymnal, 1970), p. 2.

satisfy both caution about any revision whatsoever and desire for complete freedom to compose all prayers, the Standing Liturgical Commission has charted a new course.

It now offers, in 1971's Prayer Book Studies 21: *The Holy Eucharist*, for the Episcopal Church's responsible experimentation, two complete Eucharistic liturgies³⁵ and an Order of Service³⁶ for use in circumstances other than regular parish celebrations. In all of them continuity with Christian tradition is maintained by preserving the structure of the liturgy.

The first of these Services preserves the language of 1928 so far as was deemed advisable. It also recognizes the positive features³⁷ of the Eucharistic Prayer of 'the Liturgy of the Lord's Supper' by permitting it as an alternative in this rite. In addition, a short form of the revised 1928 Prayer of Consecration is provided for use when necessary. The most important observation to be made about this service is that it cast substantially the entire 1928 rite within the framework which is as both *ancient* and *fundamental* to eucharistic worship. The framework is further clarified by the insertion of titles and sub-titles, to point up the basic divisions and to note transitions from part to part, a practice initiated in Prayer Book Studies.³⁸

Following an introduction with the *Gloria in excelsis* as its

³⁵ *Services for Trial Use*. Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. (1971), pp. 39-76.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 79-81.

³⁷ *The Eucharistic Liturgy*, pp. 147-150.

³⁸ *The Liturgy of the Lord's Supper*.

climax, the service proceeds with: (1) The Proclamation of the Word of God, beginning with a Salutation and the Collect of the Day, incorporating reading from the Bible, the Sermon, and the Collect, and ending; if desired with an act of penitence; (2) The Prayers, comprising an expanded form of what has come to be known as the Prayer for the Church, and an alternate place for the Confession and Absolution in one of two forms³⁹; (3) The Celebration of the Holy Communion, in which the fourfold action of Offertory, Thanksgiving, Breaking of the Bread and Communion is placed. This follows with a brief prayer of thanks, Blessing and Dismissal.⁴⁰

The Confession and Absolution may be used before the service, where the penitential act would form an introduction to worship. Another change has been introduced in the Order of the Proclamation of the Word of God. It is the placing of the Sermon immediately after the Gospel, where it may be more closely related to the Scripture lessons.

Two points are to be stressed in connection with the Nicene Creed: when, and in what form, it is to be used. 'The Liturgy of the Lord's Supper,' recognizing a growing custom, prescribed the Creed only on Sundays and other festivals and made it optional on other occasions. The first service makes the same provision. The wording of the Creed is, however, a more complex problem.

³⁹ *Services for Trial Use*, p. 45.

⁴⁰ John Gordon Davis, *A Select Liturgical Lexicon* (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1965), p. 64.

The Standing Liturgical Commission, after responsible historical research, could possibly produce a felicitous and accurate translation of this Creed. to do so, however, would fail to take into account the work being done co-operatively among the various Christian bodies . . . through the agency of the (ICET) International Consultation on English Texts.⁴¹

It seems logical that whenever the Creed (the corporate confession of the church's faith) is recited, it should be in a widely-accepted form. The ICET version⁴² restores the first personal plural of the original text, and in this, and several other respects, follows the translation proposed by the Standing Liturgical Commission in 1967.⁴³

The Commission offers seven prayers of Intercession in various forms,⁴⁴ which may be used in place of the Prayer for the Church and the World. Some of these are primarily intended for use with the First Service, addressing God in the second person singular. After the Offertory and when all has been prepared for the Thanksgiving over the elements, the Priest (as president of the eucharistic fellowship) starts with *Sursum Corda* and the Thanksgiving (Prayer of Consecration) follow the order and phraseology of the 1928 Prayer Book.

The place of the Breaking of the Bread, after the Lord's Prayer is not particularly startling, however, since this has been done in the past, either as a practical measure when large wafers or a loaf have been used, or as a symbolic act to emphasize the

⁴¹ *The Holy Eucharist*, p. 13.

⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 31-34.

⁴³ *The Liturgy of the Lord's Supper*, pp. 7-8.

⁴⁴ *Services for Trial Use*, pp. 93-110.

participation of all the faithful in the one bread.⁴⁵ Likewise, as a means of exemplifying this participation the Prayer after Communion may be said by the congregation with the Celebrant. The Prayer of Humble Access⁴⁶ has been revised and made optional.

By making some parts of this service (*First*), optional and allowing the substitution of briefer forms for some other portions, the Commission has devised a liturgy within the spirit of 1928 and in the pattern of 1967, useful on a variety of occasions.

The *Second Service*, using the 1967 Liturgy as a starting point, responds to the frequently expressed criticism that this rite came to rest between the tendencies toward contemporaneity and traditionalism. Although this Service chooses the direction of contemporaneity, it maintains a link with its parent rite by allowing the alternative use of the 1967 Eucharistic Prayer in a form congruent with the rest of the Service in employing the pronoun "you" in divine address.

This Service, like the *first*, follows the pattern of the 1967 Liturgy of the Lord's Supper. The opening expresses the worship of God the Father, through the mediation of Jesus Christ, in the fellowship of the Holy Spirit. The Gloria in Excelsis is the version made by the International Consultation on English Texts (ICET). The opening part of the service is concluded with the Gloria, or one of the alternatives⁴⁷ for it.

⁴⁵ I Corinthians 10:17.

⁴⁶ *Services for Trial Use*, p. 51.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 66.

The Proclamation of the Word of God begins with the Salutation by the presiding Minister, followed by the Collect of the Day, and, like the First Service, it allows for one or two lessons to precede the Gospel, with psalms, hymns, or anthems between them. The Nicene Creed is taken from ICET text.

There are normative topics of corporate intercession of the church. These forms may be used with the *First* as well as the *Second Service*. They include two versions of an ancient litany: one is adapted directly from the Greek Orthodox Church; the other is based on a skillful western adaptation.⁴⁸ Both forms (Intercessions I and V) incorporate more current concerns. The Second of the intercessions, is an open form consisting of bidding followed by silence, during which members of the congregation are free to expose their own personal needs and petitions for the concern and attention of the entire worshipping body. The next prayer, more structural, is cast in dialogue form, the leader starting the subject of the petition, and the people responding with the intention.⁴⁹

The variety of prayers of intercession, ranging from the most ancient to more contemporary and open forms, and including two based on intercessions devised by sister churches of the Anglican Communion, should go far to meet the needs of times and occasions.

⁴⁸ F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896, 1965), Col. 1, pp. 362-363, 388ff.

⁴⁹ This form is based on one of the litanies in the New Zealand Experimental Liturgy, 1966; quoted in Buchanan, *op. cit.*, pp. 132-133.

The Prayers are followed by the greeting of Peace between the Celebrant and the congregation, and it is recommended that it be followed by an exchange of greetings among the ministers and the people, in order that the corporate quality of the eucharistic offering be emphasized (Matthew 5:24).

The celebration of the Eucharist begins with the Offertory and proceeds to the Great Thanksgiving, with the *Sursum Corda*, also an ICET text, as is the *Sanctus* and the Lord's Prayer. The giving of thanks for Creation and Redemption leads into the familiar words concerning the Bread and the Wine. At this point, the congregation joins the Priest in an acclamation of God's mighty acts in Christ. This constitutes the liturgical anamnesis. The Priest then proceeds with an invocation and a concluding doxology, to which the people respond with a clearly audible Amen.

This Second Service introduces a large measure of flexibility into a firm structure virtually identical with that of the First. Both are recognizably derived from the 1967 Liturgy of the Lord's Supper. . . . It is hoped that the Second Service achieves what so many correspondents and critics have asked for: contemporaneity, flexibility, and clarity, combined with that dignity which is so vital an ingredient in the liturgical tradition of the Anglican Communion.⁵⁰

'An Order for Celebration of the Holy Eucharist is the additional Order which is fundamentally an outline of the elements considered necessary for Celebrating the Eucharist. It permits a wide latitude in the choice of forms for these elements, so as to expose the unique concerns of the specific community doing the liturgy.

⁵⁰ *The Holy Eucharist*, pp. 22-23.

Since, however, the Eucharistic Prayer is the corporate responsibility of the Church, specific limitation is placed on the freedom of this order by prescribing the use of one of several (four) Eucharistic Prayers.⁵¹

Each of these four Eucharistic Prayers given in this Order, has its own distinctive quality. Each includes a thanksgiving to God the Father for some aspect of creation, culminating in a thanks for the gift of his only-begotten Son Jesus Christ. A recital of the words of institution follows, with an invocation and oblation, climaxing in a doxology to the Father, through the Son, in the unity of the Holy Spirit.

The need for such an Order has been made urgent by the growth within the church itself, and especially on the overlapping peripheries of many churches, of groups of people of varying size and character, who are searching for a living experience of worship outside of what, to them at least, appears as a rigid institutional framework.⁵²

The Order is designed for groups, because Eucharist is made only by an assembly, however small. The Christian Church is community; it is more than a random gathering of people. It is a group of people who by their incorporation into the Christian Church affirm a certain confession of faith which is preeminently set out in the Scriptures.⁵³

These proposals (1953's Prayer Book Studies IV: *The Eucharistic Liturgy*; 1967's Prayer Book Studies XVII: *The Liturgy of the Lord's*

⁵¹ *Services for Trial Use*, pp. 82-89.

⁵² *The Holy Eucharist*, p. 25.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

Supper; and 1971's Prayer Book Studies 21: *The Holy Eucharist*) have been offering additional forms for the celebration of the Holy Eucharist and have been given the continuing availability of the 1928 Prayer Book and its predecessors.

"The Commission offers these services for the whole church . . . to make use of all the orders, to study them thoughtfully, and to experiment reverently with each of them."⁵⁴

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

CHAPTER III

AN OVERVIEW OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST

The full, official title of 1971 service as proposed is: "*The Holy Eucharist: The Liturgy for the Proclamation of the Word of God and Celebration of the Holy Communion.*" The title itself indicates a great deal about the content and the intent of what is to follow and about the approach and presuppositions of the Standing Liturgical Commission which formulated and proposed it. In fact, from a careful study and examination of the title alone it can get a helpful overview of the entire service. But, before that, two things can be said about Eucharist and Liturgy.

'Eucharist' is found in the Didache¹ and has its roots in numerous texts of the New Testament itself--notably Matthew 26:27, Mark 14:23, Luke 23:17, 19, Philippians 4:6, I Timothy 2:1 and I Corinthians 11:24, 14:17. The Holy Eucharist is the only expression for the essential character of the Service which has been universal in all ages in all parts of the historic church.

'Liturgy' means 'the work of the people.'² In the Holy Eucharist, this is the work of the "people of God"--the process in and through which the Episcopal Church not only understands itself, but also

¹F. L. Cross (ed.) *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (London: Oxford University Press, 1957), p. 397.

²λειτουργία: a combination of λαός (people) and ἔργον (work).

is confronted by God and responds in worship and commitment to mission.

The Holy Eucharist consists of a number of elements:³

1. The Preparation
2. The Ministry of the Word
3. The Prayers
4. The Offertory
5. The Thanksgiving over Bread and Wine
6. The Breaking of the Bread
7. The Communion
8. The Dismissal.

THE PROCLAMATION OF THE WORD OF GOD

1. The Preparation

There is no traditional pattern for the opening of the liturgy. The ancient church was satisfied with a simple greeting of Celebrant and people before the reading of the lessons. But later ages felt this beginning too abrupt, and elaborated the opening by a variety of devotional acts, whether of praise, or penitence, recollection or petition.⁴

It has been difficult for the Standing Liturgical Commission in resolving the question,

How does one begin an act of corporate worship? Does one address God, or do the Officiant and congregation address one another? Is the dominant attitude of the worshipper who faces

³ Colin O. Buchanan (ed.) *Modern Anglican Liturgies, 1958-1968* (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), pp. 31-32.

⁴ *The Liturgy of the Lord's Supper* (New York: Church Pension Fund, 1966), p. 26.

God, deliberately and attentively, one of adoration or of unworthiness? Is it more natural to begin with:

Acclamation: 'Alleluia,' 'Hosanna,' 'Kyrie eleison';

Petition: 'Open our lips,' 'Cleanse our hearts,' 'Remember not our offences'

Bidding: 'The Lord be with you,' 'Come let us worship'⁵

Probably, any experienced worshippers would no doubt affirm that all three approaches are agreeable, that a combination of them in proper proportion is fitting and edifying. The gathering of the scattered members of Christ for 'Eucharist' and 'Communion' should be marked from its very beginning by the aim of praise and reconciliation.

The 1971 proposed "Holy Eucharist" begins with a doxological greeting of Officiant and people, which fulfills both the need of mutual salvation and an immediate direction of the Eucharistic assembly towards God and His Kingdom. "Blessed be God: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. (Priest) And blessed be his kingdom, now and forever. Amen." (People) or,

Almighty God, unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid: Cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of thy Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love thee, and worthily magnify thy Holy Name; through Christ Our Lord. Amen.

This is an attempt to meet the conditions of brevity and flexibility suggested by the Special General Convention II, of the Episcopal Church in 1969. It is designed to preserve values of longstanding in the tradition of Western and Anglican custom, to provide a just balance in

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

the acknowledgment of God's glory and man's sinfulness and need of mercy, and to give sufficient flexibility in the distinction of festal and non-festal character in the several times and seasons of the year.

Following the doxology, collect for Purity, Summary of the Law and Kyrie, follows the pattern familiar in 1928 Prayer Book, with the addition on festal occasions of the Gloria or Trisagion. These forms, alternating in address to God and to the people, spell out in ways that have long been satisfying, the varied approaches of praise, acknowledgment, petition, and confession, which are agreeable to a proper opening for the Preparation of corporate worship.⁶ In the forms of both prayer and hymnody, there is combined a dual theme of acclamation of God's sovereign lordship and appeal for his gracious mercy and aid.

2. The Ministry of the Word

The Ministry of the Word starts with the Collect of the Day-- i.e., a short prayer which immediately precedes the lections at the Eucharist. It conveys the idea of gathering together the petitions of the people, e.g., the Collect of the Day for The Sunday of the Resurrection, or Easter Day is--

Almighty God, who through your only begotten Son Jesus Christ overcame death, and opened to us the gate of ever-lasting life; Grant that we, who celebrate with joy the solemnity of the

⁶ *The Eucharistic Liturgy* (New York: Church Pension Fund, 1953), pp. 153-156.

Lord's resurrection, may arise from the death of sin through Jesus Christ our Lord, who now lives and reigns with you and the Holy Spirit, one God, for ever and ever. Amen.⁷

After the Collect of the Day, it goes on immediately to the Reading of the Holy Scriptures. Three lessons are provided, from the Old Testament, Epistles and Gospels. For example, the Lessons assigned for the Easter Day have three options to be selected from:

Isaiah 25:6-9,

A. John 20:1-9,

or Acts 10:34-43

or Matthew 28:1-10,

Colossians 3:1-4

B. Mark 16:1-8.

C. Luke 24:1-10.

These readings can be interspersed with appointed psalms (e.g., 118:1-6, 14-18, or 66:1-11), Canticles,⁸ hymns⁹ or Anthems. After the Gospel, the sermon follows. This position for the Sermon is actually a return to a more ancient structure that is still preserved in the liturgies of the Eastern and Roman churches. The historical reason for this more ancient structure is simply due to the early church's sense of appropriateness in placing the sermon in the "Liturgy of the Catechumens," the Creed in the "Liturgy of the Faithful." There is practical value in relating the sermon more closely to the lessons, and then employing the Creed as a corporate response

⁷ *Services for Trial Use*. Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. (1971), p. 527.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 272-291.

⁹ *The Hymnal*. Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. (New York: Church Pension Fund, 1940).

of the church to the whole Word of God that has been read and proclaimed.

The Nicene Creed is to be said or sung on Sundays and other festivals, for the summary of the Faith. The Apostles Creed is not to be substituted for the Nicene Creed in context with the Eucharist. The reason for that is, that the Apostles Creed belongs to Baptism service and the daily renewal of baptismal pledge in the Office of Morning and Evening Prayer.¹⁰

3. The Prayers

After the Creed comes the Penitential Order,¹¹ as the beginning of Prayer for Christ's Church and the World. The origin and history of the material in the Penitential Order can be found in Brightman's book.¹² It is part of the oldest vernacular used in the Anglican liturgies, stemming from Cranmer's Order of the Communion of 1548, and it has been a characteristic feature of them until recent revisions, the more appropriate in view of the abandonment of the requirement of the Sacrament of Penance.

In the English First Prayer Book of 1549, the Penitential Order was placed, as it still is in the Scottish Liturgy, immediately before Communion. The English 1552 Prayer Book, followed by later

¹⁰ *Services for Trial Use*, pp. 238-268.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 45-46, 65, 69.

¹² F. E. Brightman, *The English Rite* (London: Rivingtons, 1915), i, xxi-xxvi.

Anglican rites, moved it to a position immediately before the Consecration. The 1552 Prayer Book did not have an Offertory of the elements; hence the offering of alms and Prayer for the Church were accounted part of the Ante-Communion.¹³ The penitential devotions were actually the beginning of the second part of the rite, namely that which concerned those who intended to remain for Communion. The introduction into later Anglican liturgies of a proper Eucharistic Offertory thus produced the anomalous situation of lengthy prayers and devotions separating the offertory actions from the consecrating Giving of Thanks.

Only in recent years have Anglican revisions, sought to repair this awkwardly undogmatic structure.¹⁴ The revisions made by the Standing Liturgical Commission for 1971 draft have been guided by the work done in Prayer Book Studies IV, XVII and 21. Some new suggestions for the Penitential Order of Services for Trial Use, 1971, are

- a) The Invitation has incorporated the communal character of the Confession by the phrase 'you . . . of your sins,'¹⁵ without sacrificing its direct summons to the individual conscience.
- b) The General Confession has been tightened with a more objective and factual manner of expression.

¹³ John Gordon Davis, *A Select Liturgical Lexicon* (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1965), p. 16.

¹⁴ Buchanan, *op. cit.*, pp. 35-329.

¹⁵ *Services for Trial Use*, p. 45.

c) There are optional selections provided for the Penitential Order.¹⁶

After the confession of sins, with absolutions for forgiveness, come the Intercessions, with thanksgiving. They are offered in many and various forms.¹⁷ Most of them are in litany form, and also they allow extemporary prayers and congregational participations. Some of the advantages of these new alternative forms are: a) It is a general litany such as the 1928 Prayer Book Litany,¹⁸ and is not confined to the "Church" or tied specifically to the Eucharistic Offertory such as the Prayer for the Church¹⁹ in 1928 Prayer Book. Thus it may be employed on other occasions of worship, in the same way as the Litany or the Bidding Prayer.²⁰ b) It includes, in addition to the time-honoured supplications for church and state, the needy and afflicted, and the departed, reference to wider concerns both of the churchly and communal life: the mission of the church; the vocations of men and women in commerce and industry, arts and sciences, school and home; and the proper use of the created order. A special penitential petition is also included; and the petition for the departed allows for specific reference to any particular commemorations of the day. c) It

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 45, 69.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 93-110.

¹⁸ *The Book of Common Prayer*. Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. (1928), pp. 54-59.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 74-75.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 47-48.

is formed without being inflexible. d) The congregational responses are direct and simple.

After the Prayers and Intercession, comes The Peace. The Peace is exchanged ceremonially by the embrace of one's nearest neighbour, or a kiss, or a handshake. It may be passed through the congregation either along the rows or from those in front to those behind. Or, let it happen spontaneously. It is suggested that each person as he or she gives The Peace may say "The Peace of the Lord be always with you." And the receiver replies, "And with your spirit." Another verbal option during the Peace is "any appropriate greeting in the Names of the Lord, is allowable."²¹

THE CELEBRATION OF THE HOLY COMMUNION

4. The Offertory

The basic actions of the Offertory are such as need no change or revision. The Table must be set, the gifts presented, and the elements of bread and wine prepared. The People are to stand, at least for the announcement of the Offertory, with a sentence,²² (or sentences) which looks forward to the eucharistic action, and the presentation of the gifts. This posture simply recognizes that the Offertory is essentially the People's action. Representatives of the

²¹*The Holy Eucharist* (New York: Church Hymnal Corp., 1970), p. 43.

²²*Services for Trial Use*, p. 47.

congregation are involved in the bringing and preparing of the gifts to the table.

Some textual enrichments have been made and proposed in 1971 'Services for Trial Use.' These are some fixed bidding to the Offer-tory that attempt to summarize succinctly the meaning and purpose of the action. These are placed in an appendix,²³ so as not to impede the ready following of the rite by the congregation.

5. The Thanksgiving over Bread and Wine

Once the Table is set and prepared with the elements, it is logical to proceed without delay to the Giving of Thanks. The people are to remain standing through the Preface²⁴ and Sanctus--The Sursum Corda, Preface and Sanctus are the greatest acts of praise in all the liturgy (only hymns such as the Gloria and Te Deum²⁵ can be compared with them), after which they may kneel throughout the Prayer. The basic elements and progression of this eucharistic prayer as following:

a) Reference at the beginning is made to the Creation and the Fall of man, as a background for the thanksgiving for the Incarnation and Atonement. b) the recalling of the Lord's sacrifice is enlarged,²⁶ and not confined solely to the concept of a "sacrifice for sin." His

²³ *Ibid.*, pp. 112-113.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 115-123.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 286.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 72-73.

sacrifice involves also his total taking upon himself of man's nature and his perfect obedience.²⁷ c) while retaining the tradition of the 1928 Prayer Book conflation of Matthew and I Corinthians, the Word of Institution has been conformed to the style of the Revised Standard Version of the Bible. d) The Prayer of Anamnesis (the work of Christ in Death, Resurrection and Ascension "until he came") follows the oblation of the Gifts. And the Anamnesis has itself been enriched by reference to the Coming again of the Lord--a restoration which many modern revisions have made after the model of the Eastern liturgies. The oblation of the worshippers is then conjoined to the oblation of the Gifts, and not separated by the Invocation. e) The Invocation--epiclesis--the double blessing of the Word and the Holy Spirit is maintained from 1928 Prayer Book. For the Word no less than the Spirit is re-creative in his function. Sanctification is sought for worshippers as well as for "these holy mysteries," so that the totality of what is here present, what is here done, and what is here offered, may be caught up in the new creation of the Word and Spirit. f) In the final Doxology, the phrase "in whom" has been restored from the Roman Canon, on which this Doxology is based (cf. Romans 11:36). g) The "now" in the bidding to the Lord's Prayer has been shifted. At present, it sounds very much like a punctuation mark! In its new position it has force.²⁸ By virtue of all that has been recited

²⁷ Bonnell Spencer, *Sacrifice of Thanksgiving* (West Park, N.Y.: Holy Cross, 1965).

²⁸ *Services for Trial Use*, p. 73.

concerning our redemption, worshippers may "now" have confidence in addressing God as "Our Father . . ."

6. The Breaking of The Bread

The Breaking of the Bread (the Fraction) was a utilitarian ceremony in origin. The one loaf had to be broken, if it was to be shared. Symbolically it was an obvious reference to the Lord's own broken body on the Cross. The contemplation of the mystery (of breaking for sharing) calls for more attention. In 1971 proposal, this Breaking of the Bread is done in silence and is accompanied by the words of I Corinthians 10:16-17.

7. The Communion

Just as there should be no long interruption between the Offertory and the Giving of Thanks, so there should not be extended pre-communion devotions separating the Breaking of the Bread from Communion.

A new approach to Communion is proposed in 1971 'Services for Trial Use' especially the Prayer of Humble Access. It is not only optional but also it is less penitential and more expectantly joyous.²⁹ The other alternative for its place is a responsive anthem that summons the congregation to the feast with joy and thanksgiving, and

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 51.

links the Eucharistic climax to the Easter anthem.³⁰

The invitation to Communion is done by the Celebrant saying:

The Gifts of God for the People of God.
 Take them in remembrance that Christ
 Gives himself for you, and feed on
 him in your hearts by faith, with
 thanksgiving.³¹

The communion of consecrated bread and wine is administered with this sentence--"The Blood of Christ, the Cup of Salvation." The reason is that they may be said to each communicant without prolonging the time of Communion.³²

8. The Dismissal

The climax of "The Holy Eucharist: The Liturgy for the proclamation of the word of God and celebration of the Holy Communion" --both formally and psychologically is communion. Yet there are optional post-communion devotions, designed to express in various forms of prayers.³³ These state that God's people are to witness and serve as the Body of Christ in the world. They are strengthened by his grace, and they are looking forward to the fulfillment of His promise.

In the Dismissal the ancient liturgies concluded the Eucharist with a dismissal (usually given by the Deacon), comparable to the dismissal of the catechumens after the ministry of the Word. The communion

³⁰ *The Book of Common Prayer*. Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. (1908), pp. 162-163.

³¹ *Services for Trial Use*, p. 74.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 75.

³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 75-76 or pp. 52-53.

itself was considered the final blessing of the service. At a later time, when frequency of communion by the laity began to decline, it became customary for the Bishop, or celebrant to bless the non-communicating faithful, often just before communion, as a sort of substitute for their communion. After the rite was over, the Bishop would give a blessing to the people as he passed on his way out of the church. This final blessing was added to the Latin rite in the Middle Ages, and extended as a privilege of the Priest-Celebrant. But the ancient dismissal (the *Ite missa est*) remained as the formal conclusion of the liturgy. The priestly blessing was an appendage, and continued to function as a substitute for a largely non-communicating congregation.

The early Prayer Books dropped the dismissal and kept the Blessing (enriching it by an opening "Peace" from *Philippians 4:7*). This has been characteristic of all Anglican liturgies to the present time. There is however a distinct trend in recent revisions and experimental rites to return to the ancient custom of considering communion as the blessing, and to end the liturgy with a dismissal. This is true of the 1971 proposal of the Dismissal in the Holy Eucharist, as the final action in the rite. The Celebrant or the Bishop, if present, may bless the people, but the Deacon (or Priest) may dismiss the people with either one of these words:

Go forth into the world,
rejoicing in the power of the Spirit.
Thanks be to God.

or

Go in peace to live and serve the Lord.
Thanks be to God.

or

Let us go forth in the name of Christ.
Thanks be to God.³⁴

The force of the Dismissal is that it sends the Eucharistic assembly out on its mission.

The 1971 proposals for the celebration of the Holy Eucharist are given not only the continuing availability of the 1928 rite in its Prayer Book form but also the 1967 Liturgy of the Lord's Supper. Each of these three services is as completely a Eucharist as any other authorized liturgy of the church that has been celebrated in its history. The standing Liturgical Commission offers these services for the whole church, "to make use of all the orders, to study them thoroughly, to consider them thoughtfully and to experiment reverently with each of them."³⁵

In November 3, 1972, Walter H. Boyd, *The Episcopal Church Press Representative*, reported to the whole Episcopal Church in the United States the debate of The House of Bishops upon the 1971 proposals for Book of Common Prayer.

The Church will not be asked to choose between traditional and contemporary language, but rather to approve a Prayer Book containing both--in the Eucharist, for example, these rites largely resembling the current three services for trial use. The House enclosed a time table proposed by the standing Liturgical

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 76.

³⁵ *The Holy Eucharist*, p. 30.

Commission which would enable the Church to revise its Prayer Book no later than 1979. The Commission estimates its waiting task will see completion by 1976. If the 1973 General Convention decides on a two year (rather than a three year) interval between conventions, the draft revised Prayer Book can be acted on first in 1977, finally in 1979. The House agreed with the Commission's recommendation that at least two full convention days be designated for initial consideration of this special order of business.³⁶

³⁶ Walter H. Boyd, *Diocesan Press Service* (New York: Episcopal Church Center, 1972), p. 3.

CHAPTER IV

THEOLOGICAL EVALUATION

THE LAST SUPPER - HOLY EUCHARIST?

The theology of the structure and contents of the proposals of 1971--*The Holy Eucharist* is built with an assumption or a theory derived from what Jesus did at the Last Supper in the Gospel according to Luke. We are told that

HE TOOK BREAD (and WINE)

HE BLESSED

HE BROKE

HE GAVE¹

Jesus' actions correspond to four elements present in the Episcopal church 1953's, 1967's *The Holy Eucharist*:

1. the offertory, by priest and people, corresponding to the taking of the bread and wine
2. the Prayer of Consecration, corresponding to the blessing or giving of thanks
3. the Fraction, corresponding to the breaking of the bread
4. the Communion, corresponding to the giving of the bread.

In the Episcopal Church 1971 proposals, these four elements are set out in clearly marked sections and together they form the

¹Matthew 26:26; Mark 14:22; Luke 22:19.

central part of the Holy Eucharist. The Synaxis² and the Eucharist complement each other.

In this chapter, if the Holy Eucharist of the Episcopal Church (proposed form 1971-1973) is based on what Jesus did at the Last Supper in Luke, we are going to investigate and exegesis the earliest gospel--that is, Mark, with its parallels.³

Translation

Joachim Jeremias in his book, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, says that the Jewish Passover Meal consists of:

A. Preliminary Course

Word of dedication (blessing of the feast day [Kiddush] and of the cup) spoken by the pater-familias over the first cup (the kiddush cup).

Preliminary dish, consisting among other things of green herbs, bitter herbs and a sauce made of fruit purie.

The meal proper is served but not yet eaten; the second cup is mixed and put in its place but not yet drunk.

B. Passover Liturgy:

Passover haggadah by the paterfamilias (in Aramaic).

First part of the Passover hallel (in Hebrew).

Drinking of the second cup (haggadah cup).

C. Main Meal:

Grace spoken by the paterfamilias over the unleavened bread.

² John Gordon Davis, *A Select Liturgical Lexicon* (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1965), p. 136.

³ Mark 14:22-25, with its parallels (Luke 22:15-21; Matthew 26:26-29; I Corinthians 11:23-25).

Meal, consisting of Passover lamb, unleavened bread, bitter herbs (Ex. 12:8) with fruit purie and wine.

Grace over the third cup (cup of blessing).

D. Conclusion:

Second part of the Passover hallel (in Hebrew).

Praise over the fourth cup (hallel cup).⁴

In our investigation of Mark 14:22-25, with its parallels (Luke 22:15-21; Matthew 26:26-29, I Cor. 11:23-25) we find the account of so-called Last Supper is not a Passover Meal. The difficulty is that the Liturgy in the Synoptic Gospels does not correspond to the Liturgy of the Passover Liturgy Meal, e.g., there are parts missing, i.e.,

No preliminary Course

No mixing of the cups

No prayers

Not four cups

No Passover Lamb

No Unleavened Bread

No Passover Haggadah

No Hallel.

So when we take these out of the Passover Meal, we have very little left. Moreover, Jesus' words of interpretation in the Synoptists do not refer to the Exodus haggadah even though Jeremias⁵ claims

⁴ Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (Göttingen: Vanhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), pp. 85-86.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 56f.

that when Jesus said, "My Body" he meant the "Bread of Affliction."

Similarly, the Jewish texts,⁶ which deal with Passover Meal say explicitly, that it is not permissible to omit the Passover Haggadah in the Passover Feast. Three essential things must not be missed, or left out, in the Passover Meal. They are:

1. Passover Lamb
2. Unleavened Bread
3. Bitter Herbs.

We do not have these in any of our texts, nor does Jesus mention any of them. In spite of all this evidence, Jeremias tries to show that the Synoptic Gospels want to make Jesus' Last Supper both the Eucharist Meal of the Church and at the same time, the Passover Meal. Why? Because for them (Mark 14:22-25; Luke 22:15-22; Matthew 26:26-29 and the parallel text of I Cor. 11:23-25) Christ was already the Passover Lamb, Himself. And this tradition is pre-Markan, which is already in I Cor. 5:7-8. It is Christological in its construction, and it is post-Easter faith. We have this in John, too. John goes further in saying that Jesus was killed on the afternoon of Nisan 15 (John 12) so that for John, Jesus was already dead before the Last Supper could have taken place. For John, Jesus' Last Supper was not a Passover Meal, but it took place on the evening of Nisan 13:40. We conclude that historically, this meal was not a Passover Meal.

⁶ Exodus 62:1-20, 24-27; 13:3-16; Leviticus 23:5ff.; Numbers 28:16ff.; Deuteronomy 16:2ff.

Exegesis

A possibility could be that Jesus had had a Last Common Meal as we see in Mark 14:17-21, Matthew 26:20-25, Luke 22:14, 21-23; John 13:21-26. Mark puts it in front of the Last Supper to make the Institution of the Last Supper the Passover Meal. But this text, Mark 14:17-21, has nothing to do with the evening of the Last Supper. It could happen at any time. Yet, there is no clear evidence.

Translation of Mark 14:22-25

καὶ εσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ὄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν, Λαβετε τοῦτο ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου.

And as they were eating he took bread and blessed and broke it and gave it to them and said, "Take, this is my body."

καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες.

And he took a cup, gave thanks and gave it to them; and they all drank out of it.

καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, τοῦτο ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπερ πολλῶν.

And he said, "This is my blood of the testament which is being poured out for many."

αμην λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πέω ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς ἡμεράς ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πέω καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

Truly, I tell you, I will not drink again of the fruit of the vine until that day I drink it new in the Kingdom of God."

Structure of Mark 14:22-25

- 22 a) Historical Narrative
- 22 b) Interpretation formula
- 22 c) Interpretation formula
- 23-23 a) Historical Narrative
- 24 b) Interpretation formula
- 25, Prophetic Statement⁷

Structure of I Cor. 11:23-25

Verse 23 a) Formula of transition of the Tradition. "For I received from the Lord what I also delivered to you, and Paul quotes. . . ."

- 23 b -24 a) Historical Narrative
- 24 b) Words of interpretation "This is my body" with another addition, "which is (broken for) for you."
- 24 c) A command to repeat, which is not in Mark, "Do this in remembrance of me."
- 25 a) Historical Narrative
- 25 b) Words of interpretation
- 25 c) Another Command to repeat, "Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me."

Notes and Comments on Mark 14:22-25, with its Parallels (Luke 22:15-21; Matthew 26:26-29; I Cor. 11:23-25).

⁷Jeremias in p. 207f. calls it as 'Jesus Avowal of Abstinence.'

MARK 14

Verse 22 a) καὶ ἐσθιόν τῶν αὐτῶν is probably Mark's reaction.

Its purpose is to integrate the Liturgical formula with the narrative Markan framework. The frequent use of (καὶ) in Mark's narrative (also verses 22, 23 and 24) is one of several signs that the tradition is Palestinian in origin.

(λαβων)

is claimed by Jeremias⁸ as an Aramaism. The nominative participle indicates a separate action, the taking of the loaf. Jeremias and Taylor⁹ show ἄρτον can be used equally of leavened and of unleavened bread.

εὐλογήσας here probably equals having offered a blessing (i.e., having thanked God). Luke and Paul both have εὐχαριστήσας at their narrative of LS. But the other use of εὐλογέω can also be followed by an object in the accusative, as for example, the fish in Mark 8:7, or the cup in I Cor. 10:16, when it means "to ask God's blessing upon the object." Taylor,¹⁰ takes it like this

⁸V. Taylor, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (London: Macmillan, 1953), p. 543.

⁹*Ibid.*, p. 544.

¹⁰*Ibid.*

in the present verse, with as the object, in which case it would mean having taken bread and blessed it.

Verse 22 b) Λάβετε: Imperative. To the command "Take," Matthew adds φάγετε to read "Take this and eat. . . ." Luke does not have the command.

Verse 22 c) τοῦτο ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου. are the words of interpretation. This appears in the shortest form in Mark and Matthew. Paul adds τὸ ὄντερ ὑμῶν. John has "Flesh."

Verse 23, καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστησας. It continues. In Luke, we have the idea of sacrifice connected with the bread, but in Mark, we have the sacrifice attached to the cup. In I Cor. 11, the idea of sacrifice is more abbreviated than Luke's.

Taylor¹¹ says that in connection with λαβὼν, "there is no reason to identify the 'cup' as the third cup known as the cup of blessing" drunk at the Paschal feast unless the occasion was that of the Passover Meal. It has been argued that since Mark here speaks of a single cup

the meal cannot have been the Passover, but must have been the Kiddush for the Sabbath (F. Spitta, G. H. Box, R. Otto) or for the

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 545.

Passover usage in respect of cups in the first century A.D. (C. F. Dalman, Jeremias, and Lagrange) is too uncertain to sustain an argument either way.¹²

καὶ ἐπιεον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες suggest that a single cup was passed around, but the more important question is why the statement is made at all. Taylor suggests that either the solemnity of the fact was vividly remembered, or possibly the statement is polemical in view of current diversities of practice.

Verse 24 a) *καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, τοῦτο ἐστιν τὸ αἷμα μου* is different from I Cor. 11. In Mark, the cup comes following the bread, while I Cor. 11:25 we have first the breaking of the bread, then a "common meal" would be framed as 'Liturgical Meal,' then the cup. Here, Paul is upset about this practice because the Christians in Corinth shifted the common meal to the beginning. The cup follows immediately after the bread. In so doing, the people eat up all the food and there is nothing left for the rest of the congregation. Not only that, but they drink before the Lord's Supper starts. So the situation here in I Cor. 11, is

¹² *Ibid.*

that, Paul pleads to the Corinthians to return to the former Order of the Lord's Supper, i.e., Bread; Common Meal and the Cup.

In the order of Mark, Paul would be against it, because of its Bread, Cup sequence. But in Mark's view (14:22) it could be interpreted that there was a meal before the Lord's Supper. It is still obscure . . .

In Matthew, the situation (26:27) "And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he gave it to them, saying . . ." is part of the narrative which turns to the direct speech of the Liturgical formula. In I Cor. 11, we don't have it at all. We have the narrative followed directly by the formula of interpretation. In Luke, it is not there. Luke and Paul go together. "Drink out all of you" is only in Mark.

Verse 24 b) ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπέρ πολλῶν. This word of interpretation is different from Paul and Luke. It includes the formula "which is being poured out for many." This formula, however, occurs also in Rom. 8:32.

Verse 25) ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι. It is a Religious oath or 'Avowal of abstinence.' Matthew has taken over in the same place, but Luke does not have it.

The formula ends with this avowal, and the narrative also ends. Here Mark is different from Paul. It is highly liturgical. Both Mark and Paul have the archaic elements. Mark has the formula "given for you" connected with the cup--not with the Bread as in Paul. Mark has no command to repeat even though we presuppose he has expanded the definitions attached "to my blood" from one to two. He has "the blood of my covenant" instead of "the blood of the new covenant in my blood." Because of these, probably both Mark and Paul possess two different old formulas. But in the case of Paul, it is old, because he says so.

The question is, is Mark or Paul older? Is it possible to say that one of them is older and one of them is younger and the one developed out of the other? Or, do we have to say that we have different forms from the early beginning and they are independent from each other--they share certain ideas, and they do not share other ideas, but they did not develop out of each other? Our present problem is that given the nature of the differences and similarities as such, it is impossible for us to explain one and the other. But,

probably Mark and Paul exist side by side from the very beginning. Unlike Jeremias, who tries to reconstruct all the existing texts of the Lord's Supper, traces them and claims that they were springing out from an original one--Schurmann¹³ would argue that from the beginning of the church life, there were various forms and practices of liturgies which all claimed to be instituted originally by Jesus.

MATTHEW 26:26-29 We see more or less that Matthew goes along with Mark and only occasionally changes his formula; his chief additions, notably the phrase "for the remission of sins" are commonly ascribed to the influence of liturgical use and theological reflection.

LUKE 22:15-20 We have a different situation in Luke, and we are facing two problems:

- 1) Luke has a different order in comparison with Mark.
- 2) In the MSS traditions, we have a confusion, e.g., in our text apparatus, we have MSS that change around verses, leave out verses, mix verses together, etc. . . Also, there are MSS

¹³ Heinz Schurmann, *Traditionsgeschichtliche: Untersuchungen zu den Synoptischen Evangelien* (Dusseldorf: Patmos, 1968).

which have a shorter and longer version of the whole.

Two sections of Luke 22:15-20 are to be considered:

* first, verses 15-18,

** second, verses 19-20,

First section: Verse 15, Here we find something new--Jesus expresses his desire to eat with his disciples before he suffers.

Verse 16, we have the words of Jesus--"For I tell you I shall not eat it (never eat it again) until it is fulfilled in the Kingdom of God"-- which seems to be another version of Mark 14:25, or Luke took it from another tradition (?)

Verse 17, After the words of Jesus, he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he said, "Take this and divide it among yourselves . . ." Here we have the cup first, not the bread. Also, we have the cup mentioned first in I Cor. 10:16-17.

In Luke it states that Jesus receives the cup rather than taking the cup. In addition, we have the command--"divide it among yourselves" instead of Mark, "Drink it out among you." The different texts certainly reflect different traditions.

Verse 18, is another saying of Jesus which is

similar to Mark 14:25. It is similar to Verse 16, which is a doublet.

Second section: (Verses 19-20) is different with difficult textual and critical problems, namely that the transcript traditions contain partly longer and partly shorter texts.

The short text breaks off after Verse 19 a). The longer text adds, "which was given for you. Do this in remembrance of me," and the Verse 20.

In Luke, the longer version texts consists of: Cup, bread, cup. The shorter text does not have the second cup. It has:

* The Taking of the Cup, the blessing,
handing out, the drinking of the cup.

* 18-19a) Taking of the bread, blessing,
breaking of the bread plus Bread--word (the interpretation of bread word). Verse 19 is close to I Cor. 11:23-25, but not identical word about cup.

* Verse 20 is close to Paul in the same way.
But Paul talks about the cup after the meal and it is also the tradition in Luke, but again it is different.

The Long Text consists of:

Verse 15, Words of Jesus

16, Words of Jesus

17 a) The first narrative section.

First cup.

b) Command to receive and distribute

18, Words of Jesus

19 a) Continuation of the narrative

"Jesus takes . . . breaks . . .

gives thanks . . . and gives to

them and says . . ."

b) Words of interpretation

c) Command of Repetition

20 a) Continuation of narrative--"takes

the cup, after meal, (this is the
second cup) saying . . . ,"

b) Words of interpretation of the

cup.

In Verses 15, 16, and 18, we have words of Jesus. The first cup is being blessed but it is not identified and interpreted. Then we have a common meal (verses 17, 19, and 20). In other words, we have the first cup, the bread and then a common meal, and after the common meal we have another cup.

This kind of shift, Schurmann argues, cannot be just Luke's imagination. He must have different sources or a different practice behind these different manuscripts, different practices in the church, as we know this from Paul.

The question is only whether Luke's longer form or shorter form is older. But, this is still debated among the scholars.

Interpretation

In Luke's view: Jesus is celebrating his last meal as a farewell meal with his disciples, e.g., "The hour of the Passion has come." The meal is a Passover Meal. Jesus does not participate in the consumption of the food, himself. And, at the same time, this meal anticipates the eschatological meal of Salvation. The Festival Meal for Luke is the institution of this meal as the last and the greatest gift of Jesus which he left with his disciples. Before his death, and from now on until the Parousia, the eucharistic meal will be celebrated in the church.

In Mark: The meal is the Liturgical order of his church--which means that: Jesus is present in the Liturgy and is the Liturgy of the church. Mark also wants this meal to be a Passover one as the fulfillment of the Jewish meal--Passover.

In John: The meal to John is the embodiment of the Passover Lamb and the Sacrifice of Jesus, together.

In I Cor. 11: Paul sees the meal as a memorial of Jesus because he commanded "to do this in remembrance of me." Also, the meal is a prayer and fellowship of the community--a remembrance before God--that God should remember His Messiah by bringing into existence His Kingdom. To "do this" by Jesus' disciples, i.e., to celebrate

the meal, is to realize the final consummation of God's redemptive purpose as accomplished in the Passion, death (resurrection of Jesus) and His coming at the Parousia. The repetition of the meal by his disciples, in remembrance of Him, would be a bond uniting them "until he comes."

In Matthew: Matthew sees this meal as a Passover Meal which Jesus gives a new meaning. Jesus commands his disciples to participate, not only by eating and drinking with him as an act of self-committal and a sharing in His sacrifice, but possibly, also, by dying with Him, His blood, which the contents of the cup symbolized is "my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins" to God on their behalf, (Matthew 26:29). This meal is an anticipation of the Messianic banquet that Jesus would share with his disciples in the coming kingdom.

These theological points from the Last Supper in Mark, I Corinthians, Luke, Matthew, and John are incorporated into six varieties of Eucharistic Prayers offered by the 1971 proposal to be used alternatively. One of these Eucharistic Prayers is quoted directly from *The Services for Trial Use:*¹⁴

In the following Prayer, the *italicized* lines are spoken by the People.

The Lord be with you.
And also with you.
 Lift up your hearts.
We lift them up to the Lord.

¹⁴ *Services for Trial Use.* Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. (1971), pp. 84-87.

Let us give thanks to the Lord our God.

Let us praise him for his goodness now and for ever.
God of all power, Ruler of the Universe, you are
worthy of glory and praise.

Glory to you for ever and ever.

At your command all things came to be, the vast
expanse of interstellar space, galaxies, suns, the
planets in their courses, and this fragile earth,
our island home:

By your will they were created and have their being.

From the primal elements you brought for the race of man,
and blessed us with memory, reason, and skill;
you made us the rulers of creation.
But we turned against you, and betrayed your trust;
and we turned against one another.

Have mercy, Lord, for we are sinners in your sight.

Again and Again, you called us to return.
Through prophets and sages you revealed your righteous Law;
and in the fullness of time, you sent your only Son,
born of a woman, to fulfill your Law,
to open for us the way of freedom and peace.

By his blood, he reconciled us.

By his wounds, we are healed.

And, therefore, we praise you,
joining with the heavenly chorus,
with prophets, apostles, and martyrs,
and with men of every generation
who have looked to you in hope;
to proclaim with them your glory,
in their unending hymn:

Priest and People

Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might,
heaven and earth are full of your glory.

Hosanna in the highest.

Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord.
Hosanna in the highest.

The Priest continues

And so, Father, we who have been redeemed by him,
and made a new people by water and the Spirit,
now bring before you these gifts.

Sanctify them by your Holy Spirit
 to be for us the Body and Blood
 of Jesus Christ our Lord.
 On the night he was betrayed,
 he took bread, said the blessing,
 broke the bread, and gave it to his friends,
 and said, 'Take this and eat it.
 This is my Body, which is given for you.
 Do this for the remembrance of me.'
 In the same way, after supper, he took the cup,
 and said 'Drink of this, all of you.
 This is my Blood of the new Covenant,
 which is poured out for you and for all mankind
 for the forgiveness of sins.
 Whenever you drink it, do this for the remembrance of me.'

Priest and People

When we eat this Bread
 and drink this Cup,
 we show forth your death, Lord Christ,
 until you come in glory.

Priest

Lord God of our Fathers,
 God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,
 God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ:
 Open our eyes to see your hand at work in the world about us.
 Deliver us from the presumption of coming to this Table
 for solace only, and not for strength;
 for pardon only, and not for renewal.
 Let the grace of this Holy Communion
 make us one body, one spirit in Christ,
 that we may worthily serve the world in his name.

Risen Lord, be known to us in the breaking of the Bread.
 Accept these prayers and prises, Father,
 through Jesus Christ, our great High Priest,
 to whom with you and the Holy Spirit,
 your Church gives honor, glory, and worship,
 from generation to generation.
 Amen.

This particular Eucharistic Prayer is fuller and more elaborate
 than the other five.¹⁵ It allows the congregation to participate by

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 48-50, 72-73, and 83-89.

appropriate responses. Each of the six Eucharistic Prayers given in this 1971 proposal has its own distinctive quality. Each includes all the theological aspects from the references of the Last Supper,¹⁶ in a thanksgiving to God the Father, for some aspect of creation and a passover (redemption) in a thanksgiving for the gift of His only begotten Son, Jesus Christ. A recital of the words of institution (narrative of the Lord's Supper) follows--with an invocation and oblation, climaxing in a doxology to the Father, through the Son, in the unity of the Holy Spirit. Each of the six prayers is thoroughly Biblical and theological, both in content and in wording.

These theological points from the references of the Last Supper are some of the cornerstones found in the proposal of 1971 - The Holy Eucharist: The Liturgy for the Proclamation of the Word of God and Celebration of the Holy Communion, of the Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

¹⁶Mark 14:17-21; Matthew 26:20-25; Luke 22:14, 21-23; John 13:21-26; I Corinthians 11:23-25.

CHAPTER V

EVALUATION IN LIGHT OF CONTEMPORARY ISSUES

I wish to pinpoint some contemporary issues which seem to be crucial for further consideration and study for the Fall, 1973 General Convention of the Episcopal Church in its revision of life in liturgies.

INTERACTION

The Episcopal way of life in liturgies has become concerned merely with the right forms, structures, contents and theology in certain periods of its life here in the United States of America, but fails to *stir* and *lead* its members and the world involved towards the point of encounter with God for the salvation of all men, women, and children. The right structures, contents and theology are necessary but not sufficient. A human concern about the form and content of any liturgy in our times, cannot be reduced to only four or five experts in theological theorems, or only to some who have deep philosophical insights about liturgies. The present effect or failure or both of the 1971 proposal cannot be decided and more or less prescribed by clergy or theologians or philosophers or academicians; it does not belong primarily to the theoretical level.

I am trying to suggest that it is the whole concrete gathering of the 'followers of Christ' who make liturgies together in the voice of the spirit. To *stir* the members in liturgy is

not by decree or by mere thought and decision, but by the thrust of the community, by the pushing of the spirit, by the force of the circumstances, by the creation of man, by the spontaneity of the situation. We can only provide the appropriate 'frame' where the Spirit can thrive and also where shallowness, low instincts, or irrational forces will not prevail.¹

And to *lead* the members in liturgy in a fair degree of unity in the faith and spiritual experience is offered namely,

in the crucified and risen Lord as well as in one's fellow men. These two always belong together. Worship is realised precisely as transcendence becomes credible in immanence. To believe (have faith) in God today means to seek God and one's fellow men in the figure of Jesus . . . and at the same time meet . . . fellow man.²

in and through liturgies. Liturgy is to be fulfilled whenever faith in God and love for mankind is made available to the world. Thus liturgy always being on the move with faith, is man or woman who has a claim to be loved by God and neighbor.

In the 1971 Proposal, the joint nature of liturgy claimed above does not come through, because communication within the Episcopal community has for so long been largely a one-way process, viz. from the pastor as the so-called Active communicator--to the congregation--the passive receivers. Despite the re-emphasis on the active participation of the laity in *The Green Book*, this idea still holds strong in the 1971 Proposal. But communication is a two-way process of giving and receiving, of sharing, which involves the whole community actively

¹ Raymundo Panikkar, "Secularization and Worship," *Studia Liturgica*, VII:1 (1970), 40.

² Karl Ferdinand Muller, "Living Worship," *Studia Liturgica*, VII:2-3 (1970), 87.

and creatively. The Episcopalians are so concerned about the difficulties and embarrassments of communicating their faith and belief to non-believers. This reflects also in their failure to communicate among themselves! The Eucharistic liturgy is the place "par excellence" for communication and participation involving the whole Christian community. What is needed, "is for more small groups (house-groups)," where belief can be shared and explored, vital issues and needs discussed, policy hammered out (in making eucharist together). These might well celebrate their common life in "house Eucharists" and such groups could play a large part in revitalizing the regular Sunday Eucharist."³

This re-inforces one of the possibilities, that making and sharing liturgy, forms and moulds every member of the "Body of Christ" in connection with its parallel: that every man or woman also influences Liturgy. She or he does so through her or his participation, action, living relationship with her or his fellow members and through her or his commitment which identifies her or him with the One who sacrificed Himself in order to give wholeness to all creation.

CULTURE

The Episcopal Church way of life has been too formal, yet its life in liturgies should be more flexible in order to respond to and

³Paul Fisher, "Present-day Liturgical Renewal," *Studia Liturgica*, VIII:1 (1971-1972), 48.

meet its contemporary and spontaneous cultural and societal situations and conditions. As Fisher states,

Liturgy is cultural, because it cannot be celebrated apart from culture-patterns. It involves a considerable degree of formation, in bringing man to the point at which he is open to transformation . . . Here is the ecstatic, revolutionary dimension of liturgy, an activity which is not only conditioned by culture, but also conditions culture, since it is a mainspring for new creation, forging new paths for self-understanding and communication.⁴

The liturgy of the church presupposes a common understanding and a range of common and expected, natural and spontaneous responses, emotional and volitional on the part of the Episcopal members' community, not a fixed or formed 'set of' formulas. Liturgies as we know them, presuppose a common culture. Liturgies are alive and they are the functions of a living and growing culture; because the languages, symbols, attitudes and emotions, deployed in any liturgy, must arise from a wide basis that reaches out into the whole life and culture, or at least into a major part of it. This means that to keep a living liturgy today requires the vigorous and flexible preservation of a sub-culture; and the richer and more complex the liturgy, the more massive must be the sub-culture supporting it. "Public worship of any ritual formality can exist only in a cultural context."⁵

Another reason for the Episcopal Church way of life in liturgies should be more flexible in order to meet and interact creatively with its contemporary and spontaneous cultural situations and conditions

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

⁵ Charles Davis, "Ghetto or Desert: Liturgy in Culture Dilemma," *Studia Liturgica*, VII:2-3 (1970), 20.

is because of "peoples," varying in race, size and character, who are searching for spontaneous and living experience of liturgy outside of what, to them at least, appears as a rigid, formal and institutional structure. "Such groups are not limited to young people, although the young have been most vocal in their demands for freedom and spontaneity in worship."⁶

The growing work of the Episcopal Liturgies, is the task of the members, both in making Christ present to the world and in offering the world to God, through Christ. Today, some Christian denominations (the Episcopal Church is "on the fence") facilitate their own cultural languages, spontaneous rituals, and movable furnitures to suit their activities in liturgies. In the liturgies of God, especially in the expression of belief and faith about God and the offering of Christ to the world, the Episcopal Church must aim at the best possible contemporary cultural patterns of expression. It is this world "now" and our involvement in it, which we offer in the "now" liturgies. "Our offering therefore cannot be divorced from the culture patterns of secular life. Any 'religious culture' (the community culture of the church) must be constantly evaluated in the light of the church's offering of, and dialogue with, the world."⁷

⁶*The Holy Eucharist* (New York: Church Hymnal Corp., 1970), p. 25.

⁷Fisher, *op. cit.*, 46.

SEX

The Episcopal Church way of life in liturgies has been segregating its members by sexes. Male or female is not the determining factor, or requirement, or right to be Christian--as a member of the congregation or the *clergy*--but every baptized member in his or her life in liturgies, participates, contributes, shares and acts the work and mission of God, the Father, through Jesus Christ in the Power of the Holy Spirit, entrusted to all (males and females) of his followers.

The nature of segregation of the Episcopal members in their way of life in liturgies, is the question of: who officiates eucharistic liturgies? The answer is any 'ordained' male (not female!) in the Episcopal Church. So the issue here is to endorse the theological principle of the ordination of women to the Priesthood and their consecration to the Episcopate. The approaching Fall 1973 General Convention of the Episcopal Church bids its members to sort out their thoughts and feelings in Christ Jesus, on the matter of the ordination of Women to the Priesthood and Episcopate. Several dioceses, including the diocese of New York,⁸ have voted to petition the 1973 General Convention for the enabling canonical legislation. The Episcopal Theological Seminary has strongly urged ordination of women priests as part of the agenda for theological education.⁹

⁸ The final vote at the New York Diocesan Convention on May 9, 1972 was: Clergy 141 yes; 91 no; laity: 154 yes; 96 no.

⁹ *The Bulletin of the Episcopal Theological School* (April 1972).

According to the *Services for Trial Use*, the priest is granted authority "to preach, to declare God's forgiveness to penitent sinners, to baptize, to preside at the celebration of the mysteries of Christ's Body and Blood, and to perform the other ministrations entrusted to you."¹⁰ The first of these functions is the least controversial, despite the Biblical injunctions "against women speaking in church,"¹¹ and the fact that preaching is considered an integral part of the liturgy. Episcopalian are puzzled to learn that women are more welcome by clergy in the pulpit than in the sanctuary. Baptizing, the basic initiatory liturgy of the Episcopal Church, is permitted to deacons (who may be women) though, according to the *Services for Trial Use*: "Normally the Bishop will be the chief minister."¹² That leaves absolution, celebration of the Eucharist, and "other ministrations."¹³ Why should these duties be considered any more sacrosanct than the others? If women can be ordained at all, it must be to the full apostolic ministry!

Jesus did not ordain priests; he commissioned apostles to preach the Good News, forgive sins, baptize, heal, and finally to celebrate the Eucharist. True, the apostles were all men, representing the Twelve Tribes. This could not be otherwise, given the social

¹⁰ *Services for Trial Use*. Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. (1971), p. 439.

¹¹ I Corinthians 14:34-35, etc.

¹² *Services for Trial Use*, p. 22.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 439.

structures of the time, and Jewish theology, whereby women were not, strictly speaking, members of Israel at all. Of the male apostolate, Hodgson notes that Jesus "did not go beyond the commissioning of a new patriarchate"¹⁴ and did not, for example, instruct that Gentiles be admitted on equal terms with Jews. The significant fact is that, in spite of the times, Jesus included women among his close associates (followers) and treated and accepted them with no condescension or special deference that put them in a class apart. By his actions in dealing with women he elevated them to full personhood. With secular restrictions on women disappearing, the retention of ancient sanctions in the church invites speculation that there is more concern for the priesthood of men than the Priesthood of Christ.

The priest is the bearer of apostolic authority. Certain New Testament passages¹⁵ seem to say that women must always be under the authority of men. How then can a woman hold the authority delegated to a priest? Examining the Biblical evidence, Margaret E. Thrall¹⁶ distinguished two types of authority: (1) the direct exercise of authority by God through a human mouthpiece--the word of the Lord proclaimed by the prophets, and (2) the authority given by God to man over the rest of creation. In as far as man is separate from God,

¹⁴ Leonard Hodgson, "Theological Objections to the Ordination of Women," *Expository Times*, LXXVII (April 1966), 210.

¹⁵ I Timothy 2:9-15; I Corinthians 14:34.

¹⁶ Margaret E. Thrall, *The Ordination of Women to the Priesthood: A Study of the Biblical Evidence* (London: SCM Press, 1958).

"this authority of man over creation is to the same extent separate from the authority of God, with the possibility of its independent exercise apart from the will of God."¹⁷ Thrall maintains that the authority of the apostle, coming directly from Christ, is of the first type--prophetic rather than priestly. Both Old and New Testaments speak of women prophets.¹⁸ If apostolic authority is essentially prophetic, it can therefore be vested in women. On the other hand, Thrall continues, if the authority of men over women¹⁹ of the second type, it rests on the view depicted in Genesis 2, in which the woman is derived from the man and is a step closer to creation than he, and reflects the Old Testament understanding of male and female. Genesis 1 makes no mention of the subordination of the woman, leading Thrall to suggest "that the subordination of the woman to a man is a necessary and divinely ordained stage in the growth of human personality into the complete Image of the Creator."²⁰ Genesis 2 accounts for fallen man. Genesis 1 portrays ideal man. Here both man and woman are created in God's image and share authority: "Then God said, 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; let them have dominion . . . so God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created them; male and female he created them.'"²¹ Analyzing "subordi-

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 61.

¹⁸ Exodus 15:20-21; Judges 4:4-5, 9; Acts 21:9, etc.

¹⁹ I Corinthians 14:34, and other various household codes.

²⁰ Thrall, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

²¹ Genesis (R.S.V.).

nation" in the Epistles, Stendahl argues that the use of the technical terms for male and female quoted from this passage in Galatians 3:28, indicates that the Law of Moses has been transcended in Christ in "the most primary division of God's Creation."²² The New Testament points beyond the Fall to the Redemption, beyond necessary steps and stages, restrictions and divisions, beyond the old Adam and the Law, to the "glorious liberty of the Children of God."²³ As heirs to the Kingdom, all who confess Christ, sons and daughters alike, share the royal authority. Rules about who does what are operational, related to changing situations. Stendahl finds the present political emancipation of women to be sufficient grounds for doing away with subordination in church polity.²⁴

Not all the dioceses of the Episcopal Church in the United States of America which have given serious attention to debating the theological implications of the ordination of women, have taken the step of support for admitting them to the ministry. Thus, the Anglican Communion admits women to the office of deaconess, but the step of ordaining women has not been generally accepted.²⁵ It is significant that at the Lambeth Conference of 1968 there were observers from other

²² K. Stendahl, *The Bible and the Role of Women* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), p. 32.

²³ Romans 8:21.

²⁴ Stendahl, *op. cit.*, pp. 39ff.

²⁵ Thrall, *op. cit.*; and see also the Report of a Commission appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York: *Women and Holy Orders* (London, 1966).

different denominations who said that the ordination of women "would create a further obstacle to unity in practice,"²⁶ even if no certain theological arguments stood in the way. At the plenary session it was stated that the reasons against the ordination of women were at present inconclusive. The debate still continues and in 1971 two Anglican women were ordained in Hong Kong,²⁷ one Anglican woman was ordained in New Zealand, 1972.

The Episcopal life in liturgies should not be pushed into ordaining women to the priesthood for the wrong reasons. I believe God is calling women to ordination as priests and bishops. The whole thrust of the New Testament is toward freedom to respond to God's love with all our being to be fellow workers with Christ, in freeing others to live in wholeness, to use and grow in our talents, to let our light shine, to change, to transcend our differences. We cannot ignore this obvious movement of the Holy Spirit toward the sanctifying of all humanity by ruling that half the race is categorically unfit to represent the people of God at the altar. The Holy Spirit has led the church beyond tribal and nationalistic morality, beyond the law of vengeance, beyond racial exclusiveness and enslavement of persons, and the subjugation of women to men. Jesus made it very clear that all persons, men and women, have equal access to God's grace and gifts, equal responsibility to heed his call. Episcopalians are enjoined to

²⁶ J. Coventry, "Lambeth 1968," *One in Christ*, I (1969), 15.

²⁷ *The Time is Now*. Anglican Consultative Council, First Meeting (London, 1971).

respect the laws of the United States of America but to consider such laws operational rather than ultimately binding. Insofar as women are legally free to occupy positions of authority in the social order, those so qualified have the right and duty to share in authority placed on them. In most of the world, this freedom is now realized at least in principle. How ironic that the church, born of the Holy Spirit in radical freedom, should be the last bastion of arbitrary restrictions on women's authority!

LANGUAGE

The Episcopal Church way of life in liturgies must understand its inherited living traditions, so that its members may continue in sharing and interacting the processes of its messages, works and functions in languages, that are known and meaningful to its members today.

As Stevik states:

This passing of one era and the coming of another falls particularly hard on the Episcopal church, whose style of words used in worship is little changed since the sixteenth century . . . remains largely what it was made by the nineteenth century. A person who had spent some time listening to student opinions concluded recently, 'The trouble with the Episcopal church is not that God is dead, but the Prayer Book is.'²⁸

Though the 1928 Prayer Book (language) is still the official book, discussion of the languages of 1971 new proposals is especially serious. Today's expressions must meet the needs and verbalize the prayers of our varied community.

²⁸ Daniel B. Stevik, *Language in Worship* (New York: Seabury Press, 1970), p. 4.

English speaking Christianity has learned what prayer should sound like from good teachers. Episcopalians are heirs of an Anglican tradition of excellence. If that tradition (Tudoral language) seems no longer to be creative in voicing today's liturgies, and if we raise questions of contemporary language freshly, we would be unwise to underestimate the value of our past or let it go cheaply. Stevik argues:

A more deliberate look at the origins of the tradition in which we have been living (and which seems now to be ending) may well be in order. The English Bible and the Prayer Book were important monuments in the emergence of modern English. They have been important continuing influences in speech and literature ever since.²⁹

Though the original models of the Prayer Book were the Latin service books (the Missal, the Breviary, the Manual and others), Archbishop Cranmer had, for a number of years been making notes towards revision of these books--but in Latin. The first portion of the English liturgy to be authorized in 1548 was the Litany. In the following year, 1549, the first full English Prayer Book was issued. It combined the material of the Latin service books into one manageable volume. Liturgical Latin contains many compresses, antitheses and epigrams. It is terse and economical in words, but weighty in thought and often in sound. In rendering the Latin, Cranmer sometimes used a free equivalent with two English words for one in the Latin original. "Pecca becomes 'sins and wickedness.' Tantis becomes, 'so many and great.' Videant becomes, 'perceive and know.'"³⁰ Thus the remarkable

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

thing about these doublings is not that in the interest of fullness they are used and used extensively, but that they are used with such taste and variety of placement that they are so often effective and so seldom tiresome.

Of course, the qualities of the Prayer Book are a whole and cannot be defined by adding up specific traits. All of Cranmer's devices were used tastefully and with restraint.

In English liturgical prose Cranmer did it first and did it best. Unlike the King James Bible (the other masterpiece of the religious literature of the period), the Prayer Book is not the culmination of a tradition. Cranmer had virtually no predecessors.³¹

In America following the War of Independence, some changes were made in the Prayer Book that had been adopted for the Episcopal church. The State prayers of course were altered to suit the form of government of the new nation. Some minor changes were made in wording.³² The Prayer Book continued through the nineteenth century and half of the twentieth unquestioned and admired.

But there is a growing sense of artificiality about prayer in a language style and manner so unlike that used in any other function of today's life. The Prayer Book, as a visible bearer of the old style, no longer seems to be incomparable to many who use it. We cannot in our time be loyal to it by fixing its language and manner. That would make it a museum. We can be loyal to it by imitating the

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

³² Mills Dawley Powel, *The Episcopal Church and Its Work* (Greenwich, Conn.: Seabury Press, 1955), pp. 39-47.

thing that made it great--its grasp of the reality of God's grace and its grasp of the realities of the human heart in a language used and spoken in its own time. And, like the Prayer Book, we must express these with the best materials available from the idiom of our time.

There are undeniable problems in the language available for liturgies in the American community. Despite the influence of mass communications, we still seem to have a pluralistic language community. There is one large division between English and American speech. The American experience³³ has altered the language; it has brought into being new words, new constructions, and new rhythms. There are conspicuous regional usages, zones of prevailing speech patterns, and class distinctions. Many of the racial, cultural, and national minorities in American society retain special words and usages of great vigor and color. In addition, a distinctive manner of speech has grown up among today's American youth; vocabularies of Yiddish, black community, hippies, etc. Can the 1973 Episcopal Church express and share its life in a pluralistic language-community by a uniform liturgy? Or do we want liturgies which are closer to the passions of peoples, even though some of their manners might not be widely shared? "The language of worship never may be considered as an entity in itself, having a certain life of its own, outside of the concrete communities of men (women and children) . . ."³⁴ but any language of the communities must

³³ Harold Wentworth, (comp.) *Dictionary of American Slang* (New York: Crowell, 1967).

³⁴ Herman Schmidt, "Language and its Function in Christian

present the message of Christ clearly, sensibly and meaningfully for them.

Today in the Episcopal Church, we are confronted with many existing languages, as distinctly human phenomenons, at least in our ordinary experiences (and leaving aside the question of whether there could be, as Cranmer thinks, anything that might properly be called 'traditional language' in worship). Because worship is a response to God, addressed to God and made in the contemporary style of a moment in culture, today's liturgies must be of today; they must draw on the art that reflects our various contemporary awareness, rooted in our particular Anglican traditions and in the Christian revelation.

The response to God which the liturgies articulate is made up by today's church. Liturgies are spoken in plural forms. The liturgies, as spoken collectively, may need to be complemented by various devotions for the individual. But the individualism of our American society is so strong a force that each member voice is regarded as abstract and illusory. Yet the reality of life in Christ is corporate. We are born in community, live in community, sin in community--we are remade in community. Love, obedience and trust are learned and practiced in community. If our liturgies are to express this shared life, they must for the sake of their own integrity, search for a collective rhetoric. The meaning of Christ now requires that liturgies and their languages are to be in plural. The Episcopal

Worship," *Studia Liturgica*, VIII:1 (1971-72), 5.

church needs today some American home terms and expressions by which to describe the functions for itself which has marked similarities to the functions of the life-expression in any part of America in today's multi-cultural realities. Schmidt states:

The 'home' of the language of Christian worship is the Christian community, wherein through language inspired by the Holy Spirit, takes place in Christ--(a manifold discourse or intercourse or dialogue from God to the faithful, from the faithful to God, and among the faithful mutually, about the human and divine life poured out and growing in community).³⁵

The Episcopal Church is bound to respond to the pressures on its liturgies from changes in the cultures in which it lives and worships. The vocabulary, forms and voice of worship must use materials from the present existing cultures. The motives for a 1973 Episcopal Church liturgical life are our creative stewardship of our contemporary literary, cultural and evangelical living and growing traditions. Today's motives are derived from the splendor of the Christ to whom liturgies bear witness and from the splendors available to our human life through Him, in many languages.

ECUMENISM

The Episcopal Church way of life in liturgies must discover and understand more, participate more in the multi-denominational churches and ministries for the salvation of all and ongoing creation offered to its peoples by God in Christ. "Jesus Christ, the crucified and risen, is the foundation of the church. As the appointed

³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.

eyewitnesses of Jesus Christ the Apostles are with Him the foundation"³⁶ of Christianity.

If the Episcopal Church and the other Christian denominations are based on the faith of the early church as reflected and recorded in the New Testament, then the understanding of liturgies, ministries and their effects on ecumenism must be based on various liturgies in the New Testament. The great temptation in the study of the Episcopal Liturgies is to read into the early period of Christianity what Episcopalian experience today. But in the New Testament there is no single norm for only Episcopal liturgies of ministry on church order. It is even doubtful whether there is any ecclesiastical liturgy or office which remains with any of us Christians, regardless of the tradition we belong to in Christiandom today, as the early church conceived such a liturgy or office.³⁷

Ernst Käsemann has examined the earliest liturgies of the church and uses the phrase, "Post-Easter Enthusiasm" to describe the reaction of the early church.³⁸ The early believers rejoiced in the powerful signs of the Spirit of Jesus among them. Jesus had risen from the dead and had communicated his Spirit which made it evident to all

³⁶ Edmund Schlink, *The Coming Christ and the Coming Church* (London: Oliver & Boyd, 1967), p. 234.

³⁷ Alan Richardson, *An Introduction to the Theology of New Testament* (New York: Harper & Row, 1958), pp. 312-336; also see H. Küng, *The Church* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1968), pp. 388f.

³⁸ Ernst Käsemann, *New Testament Questions of Today* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969), p. 114.

that God was really among them.³⁹ People would recognize the presence of God within the community because of the mighty and powerful works and signs of the Spirit. Conversions would come easily to the community and with urgency as they all expected the imminent return to Christ to claim his kingdom. This Easter enthusiasm gave birth to a missionary zeal as Christianity moved outside of Jerusalem and spread into the metropolitan areas of the world.⁴⁰

Paul used the analogy of the human body to explain the meaning of the church: Just as there are many parts of the body and yet a fundamental unity, and just as one part is dependent on the other, and cannot survive without the other, so the same is true for the body of Christ. Each has its role to play and no one can claim a complete superiority.⁴¹ Each has his gift, or charisma and each contributes to the building-up of the body of Christ. In such an atmosphere, the church liturgies were free manifestations of the presence of the Spirit in the lives of the believers. There is no one liturgical structure or control but only an enthusiasm for gathering together more and more people into the community as they all waited the proximate coming of Christ.

Every genuine gift, whether high or lowly, is indeed an operation of the Spirit. It is authoritative. But this means that its exponents, precisely because they are spiritual men, are

³⁹ I Corinthians 14:24-25.

⁴⁰ Acts 6:12.

⁴¹ I Corinthians 12:27-30.

involved in the corporate whole in which and through which the Spirit of Christ shows its power; and this Spirit alone is sovereign.⁴²

The freedom that is posited of the community in general in the early days of the church, is particularly evident in the meaning and liturgies of the Apostles and Prophets.

The Episcopal Church's understanding of apostles is frequently limited to the acceptance of the twelve as the foundation stones of the church.⁴³ In reality, apostle had a broader meaning in the early church, e.g., Paul presents apostle as one of the charismatic leaders of the community. What seems to have been required as fundamental is an encounter with the risen Christ.⁴⁴ From here, there is difference in opinion. The Acts seems to also require experience with the earthly life of Jesus.⁴⁵ If such is a requirement, then Paul would be excluded. For Paul, experience with the earthly Jesus is not required, but only a mandate from the risen Lord to engage in missionary activity.⁴⁶ For Paul, the apostle is the chief among the charismatic liturgies, ministries, etc.--the founder of communities and the eye-witness to the risen Lord.

⁴² Hans von Campenhausen, *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969), p. 63.

⁴³ Peter Day, *Tomorrow's Church* (New York: Seabury Press, 1969), pp. 138-142.

⁴⁴ I Corinthians 9:1; Galatians 1:12; Acts 1:22-26.

⁴⁵ Acts 1:21ff.

⁴⁶ I Corinthians 15:11; Galatians 1:15.

Other passages⁴⁷ point to the role of the apostle as revealing the hidden secrets of God for man. He is a visionary who is not dependent on liturgy or tradition, but has personally received a vision of the Lord and has received a mandate to communicate this vision to others. The practical conclusion of such an appreciation of apostle in the early church is the birth of a ministry or liturgy that follows the more general outlook of the early community. The apostle is creative in expressing the meaning of Christ to others. He adapts and because filled with the Spirit of God, he is free from enslavement to fixed liturgy, formulas or even tradition. Paul himself is a good example of such a charismatic apostle. He has his vision of the risen Lord;⁴⁸ he has received his vision and has exercised his mandate by founding churches.⁴⁹

A second group of charismatics who contributed to similar creative liturgies and ministries were the prophets--the short-lived group of early Christian enthusiasts.⁵⁰ Their great contribution was to the sayings of Jesus, that ancient layer of the Gospels which is the oldest source of the written Gospels.⁵¹ The careful analysis of these

⁴⁷ Matthew 16:16; II Corinthians 12:1-4.

⁴⁸ Galatians 1:16; I Corinthians 15:8; Acts 9:1-9.

⁴⁹ Galatians 1:15, etc.

⁵⁰ Ernst Käsemann, "Apocalypticism," *Journal of Theology and Church*, VI (1969), 33-38.

⁵¹ R. Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), pp. 49-50.

sayings of Jesus reveals alterations and changes and perhaps even logia that were created to suit the needs of the times. The question arises: who would dare to change and even create with authority, the words of Jesus? Käsemann claims that groups known as charismatic prophets performed such a function.⁵² Käsemann finds traces of these prophets in the synoptics.⁵³ The sayings give witness to a church order that was primitive and charismatic. One who receives a prophet receives a reward, just as one who receives the follower of the prophets will receive a reward. The saying calls for a response to those who speak in the name of the Lord which brings into focus the law of the talian: what you do now God will do to you in the day of judgment.

While it must be admitted that much of Käsemann's theory on the existence of a group of charismatic prophets needs greater clarification and study, there is evidence that his theory is basically sound. There are numerous other instances in the synoptics, which could easily be seen as coming from this group, especially the examples of the law of talian,⁵⁴ and the examples of the reversal of values in the eschaton.⁵⁵ These and other instances can be seen as expansions of the sayings of Jesus by the prophets in the interest of their mission.

⁵² Käsemann, *op. cit.*, pp. 49-50.

⁵³ Matthew 10:11.

⁵⁴ Matthew 5:19; 25:29; 13:12; and Luke 6:37; 19:26.

⁵⁵ Matthew 20:16; Luke 18:114; Mark 35.

Like Paul, their liturgies, ministries, etc. were free from control and open to creative developments.

The Gospel of Matthew offers a change in the ministries and liturgies of the church. For example, the evangelist appears as a teacher-scribe in his community, a leader of the church as seen in the editorial conclusion to Jesus' parables.⁵⁶ The change from an adaptive ministry to a more custodial and retentive ministry had begun in the early church. Matthew demonstrates a clear concern for a normative past based on the actual witness to the life of Jesus and with this emphasis there is often detected an anti-enthusiastic and anti-charismatic tone. A close examination of the inauthentic but valuable conclusion to the Gospel of Matthew, demonstrates this change of perspective.⁵⁷ This gives witness to a type of ministry that must have been expected and actually existed in the early church. The change from sensational works to the sober preaching and baptizing is evident by such a comparison. So we have the clear signs of the more hierarchical and structural church.

From the free and charismatic ministries and liturgies of Paul in Corinthians, the church in Matthew is more custodial and retentive, lacking in the enthusiasm of the Post-Easter experience. Matthew exposes some development of the principle of apostolic unity and

⁵⁶ Matthew 13:52.

⁵⁷ Mark 16:15-18; Matthew 28:18-20.

succession which is also indicated in Luke-Acts and the Pastorals.

Luke-Acts is a unique two volume work based on the position of the twelve in early traditions and founded on the activities and sayings of Jesus.⁵⁸ The prologue of the Gospel manifests the concern of the author.⁵⁹ Luke's concern is the certainty of that which has been handed on by those who were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word. He will solve his problem by appealing to history and moving from Jesus to the twelve and to others ($\pi\tau\epsilon\sigma\beta\gamma\tau\epsilon\rho\sigma$, $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\kappa\omega\rho\sigma$, $\delta\gamma\alpha\kappa\omega\rho\sigma$) who continue to offer and preserve this treasure. It is very clear in the speech that Luke places on the lips of Paul at Miletus that the function of the $\pi\tau\epsilon\sigma\beta\gamma\tau\epsilon\rho\sigma$ is retentive of the tradition.⁶⁰ The unique channel of tradition is closely guarded by clearly commissioned officers. The creative and free ministries etc. of the early church are gone.

The final change is seen in the Pastorals. These letters, unlike the early letters of Paul, are addressed to individuals within the community who must be seen as the forerunners of the monarchial episcopacy of Ignatius of Antioch at the end of the first century A.D. The change is seen even in terminology. Previously $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\gamma\omega\alpha$ was used in reference to the variety of gifts that the believers had received. In the pastorals it is used exclusively in regard to the laying on of

⁵⁸ H. Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke* (New York: Harper & Row, 1961).

⁵⁹ Luke 1:1-4.

⁶⁰ Acts 17-35.

hands, or what we might call designation of office, or ordination.⁶¹

A further change in terminology is the word used to designate preaching or the deposit. Earlier New Testament writings refer to παραδοσις, something which is passed on but touched and handled and affected by being transmitted as one link in a long chain.⁶² In the pastorals the word is παραδοκη, something that is passed on but preserved in pristine beauty without the effects of being handled and touched.⁶³

The Pastoral epistles are the prototype of the retentive tradition. There was a more structural church with offices, liturgies etc., and clearly defined functions and with ministries that were basically retentive and conservative ministries, with a close watch on any signs of religious enthusiasm and with charisma limited more and more to the offices within the structural church. Certainly it must be admitted that in the experience of the early church, especially in the light of the delay of the parousia and the threat from gnosticism, a more structured church was essential if Christianity would survive the ravages of time.⁶⁴

What we have in the Pastorals as church structure is the understanding of the Episcopal Church as "Apostolic Succession" in the New

⁶¹ I Timothy 4:14; 2 Timothy 1:6.

⁶² Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957).

⁶³ I Timothy 6:20.

⁶⁴ H. Küng, *The Living Church* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1963), p. 274.

Testament and it has characterized much of the 2000 years of Christian traditions within the Anglican, Roman and Eastern traditions.

There is another school of interpretation in the New Testament which must be examined in regard to the question of ministries in the New Testament. The Gospel of John is the only Gospel that does not record the baptism of Jesus and the institution of the eucharistic liturgy. This does not mean that there is no eucharistic teaching nor baptismal teaching in John, but it does mean that what by that time had become the two great liturgies of the structured church finds no foundation in the fourth Gospel.⁶⁵ The eucharistic teaching⁶⁶ (the bread from heaven) is clearly the word of God as the eucharistic celebration. Even the opinion of Oscar Cullman,⁶⁷ shows that the meaning of the eucharist is fundamentally the giving of liturgy to others.

Baptism is also present in the fourth Gospel but it is primarily the baptism of the spirit and not of water.⁶⁸ Nicodemus is told that "Unless a man is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the Kingdom of God."⁶⁹ There is no manuscript evidence that

⁶⁵ Ernst Käsemann, *The Testimony of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1968), pp. 32-33.

⁶⁶ John 6.

⁶⁷ O. Cullman, *Early Christian Worship* (London: SCM Press, 1953), pp. 105-110.

⁶⁸ John 13.

⁶⁹ John 3:5.

"of water" is an interpolation, but there is more agreement that it was not part of the earliest meaning of the section,⁷⁰ and may not have been in the original text. At least there is a strong possibility that the chief emphasis in this text is on the baptism of the spirit and not necessarily on what had become the Sacrament of baptism in the structured church. Further evidence for a lack of structure in the Gospel of John is seen in the proclamation that we are not in need of teachers if we have the Spirit.⁷¹

There is no need for teachers in the fourth Gospel since all have been baptized by the Spirit and are filled with the truth. There is no need for someone preserving what has been passed on since the Spirit himself performs this function and his presence in the guarantee of fidelity to the teaching of Jesus. With the assurance of the Spirit, the believers can be quite free in their interpretation and preaching of the Gospel of Jesus. The Community of John is not unlike the early enthusiasts as seen in the early writings of Paul.

If the Johannine community was present, at the same time as the more structured community of the Pastorals, there must inevitably have been variety in ministry and liturgy.⁷²

If there is some truth to these suppositions, then we conclude

⁷⁰ Ignace de La Potterie, *The Christian Lives by the Spirit* (Staten Island: Alba House, 1970), pp. 11-12.

⁷¹ John 14:26; 16:13; I John 2:20; 2:27.

⁷² Käsemann, *The Testimony of Jesus*, p. 32. See also J. N. Sanders, and B. A. Mastein, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to John* (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), p. 456.

the New Testament with a clear mandate, that, there will always be a place for a charismatic and free creative community in Christianity even if the Episcopal Church proposal of its 1971 liturgies must have structure, if it (Episcopal church) is to survive in a sinful and evil world. Let it also be recalled that the creative community of John, does not deny to the structured church all right to exist. What the Johannine church seems to want and understand is co-existence with a mutual enrichment of both interpretations (creative, free and adaptive ministries and liturgies must always be found in the Christian church --just as the more retentive custodial and conservative ministries and liturgies must be found). There will always be a dialectic between historical fidelity and creative adaptability of the Episcopal Church is to grow as one of the expressions (varieties) of Jesus Christ. When the Episcopal Church falls into the trap of emphasizing one to the exclusion of the other, there must be a reaction from the forgotten quarter. Only together can the variety of denominations of Jesus Christ find its place and objective in history.

3 differences ¹Now of gifts ²there are, but the same
 Διαρεσέ̄ς δε̄ χαρισμάτων εἰσὶν τό δε̄ αὐτό¹
 spirit and differences (of) ministries there are and the same
 πνεύμα, καὶ διαρεσέ̄σες διακονιῶν εἰσὶν καὶ ὁ αὐτός
 Lord; and differences (of) operations there are ²the ¹but
 κύριος καὶ διαρεσέ̄ς εὐεργημάτων εἰσὶν ὁ δε̄
 same God - operative - all things in all. ²to each one,
 αὐτὸς θεός ὁ εὐεργῶν τὰ ταῦτα εν πασιν. ἐκάστω

¹But is given the manifestation of the spirit to the profiting. ⁷³
 δε δέδοται η φανερωσις τοῦ πνευματος προς το σομφερον.

Ecumenism is an historical phenomenon going back in all probability to the first century and the variety at Corinth. If today's various Christian denominations cannot afford to engage in internecine warfare, the same is true for those within the Episcopal Church. There is a place (variety) for free and more charismatic liturgies, ministries and communities as well as the more custodial Prayer Books, Church-orders and Laity. If Episcopalians have the ability to recognize and understand and accept the varieties between the churches, and see the possibility of differences within the churches, then Christianity (in many traditions) will have a future beyond measure. If not, no Episcopalian should be surprised if Christianity becomes a museum piece (according to an Episcopal, or Roman Catholic, or Methodist . . . tradition) without effect in our evolving today's world.

In short, the Episcopal Church in its revision of life in liturgies for the Fall 1973 General Convention in Louisville must include these above contemporary issues because they are essential for the human need and wants for the work and mission of our Lord Jesus Christ entrusted for you and me, *today and tomorrow.*

⁷³I Corinthians 12:4-7.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this is a study of Prayer Book revision in the Episcopal Church focusing on the Proposal of 1971 - The Holy Eucharist which offers two complete Eucharistic rites and an order of service for use in circumstances other than regular parish celebrations. In all of them continuity with Christian tradition is maintained by preserving the structure of the rite.

Each of these forms of service demonstrates that it is principally the structure that unifies the several rites and holds them within the compass of the church at worship. Each of them accepts their basic elements in eucharistic worship a) a form of proclamation of the Word of God by readings from Scripture, which may be elaborated by preaching and other media of communication; b) a prayer of intercession, which gathers together the worshipping community's concerns and focuses its attention upon the mission and ministry of the church as a thankful congregation; c) the liturgy of the table which intends to do again what the church affirms its Lord to have done before his death.¹

The Episcopal Church's Proposal of 1971 - The Holy Eucharist, has much to offer and has much to learn from this.

¹*The Holy Eucharist* (New York: Church Hymnal Corp., 1970), p. 10.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABBA, Raymond. *Principles of Christian Worship*. With special references to the Free Churches. London: Oxford University Press, 1957.

ABBOTT, Walter M. (ed.) *The Documents of Vatican II*. New York: Herder & Herder, 1966.

BAUER, Walter. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

BENOIT, Jean Daniel. *Liturgical Renewal*. (Studies in Ministry and Worship) London: S.C.M. Press, 1958.

The Book of Common Prayer. Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. Ratification Convention, 1801.

The Book of Common Prayer. Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A., 1889.

The Book of Common Prayer. Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A., 1908.

The Book of Common Prayer. Church of England, 1662.

Book of Common Prayer. Church of England, 1928.

Book of Common Prayer. Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A., 1928.

The Book of the Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies after the use of the Church of England. London, 1549.

BOWMER, John C. *The Lord's Supper in Methodism*. London: Epworth Press, 1961.

BOYD, Walter H. *Diocesan Press Service*. New York: Episcopal Church Centre, 1972.

The Breaking of Bread. Herder & Herder, 1969. (Concilium, 40)

BRIGHTMAN, F. E. *The English Rite*. London: Rivingtons, 1915.

_____. *Liturgies Eastern and West*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896, 1965.

BROOK, Stella. *The Language of the Book of Common Prayer*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.

BUCHANAN, Colin O. (ed.) *Modern Anglican Liturgies, 1958-1968.* London: Oxford University Press, 1968.

BUGNINI, A., and C. Badge (eds.) *The Commentary on the Constitution and on the Instruction on the Sacred Liturgy.* New York: Benziger Bros., 1965.

The Bulletin of the Episcopal Theological School. (April 1972)

BULTMANN, R. *History of the Synoptic Tradition.* New York: Harper & Row, 1963.

CAMPENHAUSEN, Hans von. *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969.

The Church and the Liturgy. Herder & Herder, 1965. (Concilium, 2)

The Church Worship. Herder & Herder, 1966. (Concilium, 12)

CLARKE, W. K. Lowther. *Liturgy and Worship.* London: S.P.C.K., 1947.

COPE, G. F., J. G. Davis, and D. A. Tytler. *An Experimental Liturgy.* (Ecumenical Studies in Worship, 3) London: Lutterworth Press, 1958.

COVENTRY, J. "Lambeth 1968," *One in Christ.* 1969.

The Crisis of Liturgical Reform. Herder & Herder, 1969. (Concilium, 42)

CROEGAERT, A. *The Mass: A Liturgical Commentary.* 2 vols. Westminster: Newman Press, 1959.

CROSS, F. L. (ed.) *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church.* London: Oxford University Press, 1952.

CULLMAN, O. *Early Christian Worship.* London: SCM Press, 1953.

DAVIS, Charles. "Ghetto or Desert: Liturgy in Culture Dilemma," *Studia Liturgica*, VII:2-3 (1970).

DAVIS, John Gordon. *A Select Liturgical Lexicon.* Richmond: John Knox Press, 1965.

DAY, Peter. *Tomorrow's Church.* New York: Seabury Press, 1969.

DEARMER, Percy. *The Story of The Prayer Book.* London: Oxford University Press, 1933, p. 136. See F. L. Cross (ed.) *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church.* London: Oxford University Press, 1957.

DIX, Gregory. *The Shape of the Liturgy*. Westminster: Dacre Press, 1949.

The Eucharistic Liturgy. The Standing Liturgical Commission of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. (Prayer Book Studies, 4) New York: Church Pension Fund, 1953.

Eucharistic Theology Then and Now. (Theological Collections, 9) London: S.P.C.K., 1968.

FISHER, Paul. "Present-day Liturgical Renewal." *Studia Liturgica*, VIII:1 (1971-1972).

FRERE, W. H. *Some Principles of Liturgical Reform*. Milwaukee: Young Churchman, 1915.

FULLER, Reginald H. *What is Liturgical Preaching?* London: S.C.M. Press, 1960.

GARRETT, T. S. *Worship in the Church of South India*. (Ecumenical Studies in Worship, 2) London: Lutterworth Press, 1958.

GRIMES, Howard L. *The Rebirth of the Laity*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

HAFINGER, Johannes. *Liturgy and the Missions*. New York: Kenedy & Sons, 1960.

HAHN, Wilhelm. *Worship and Congregation*. (Ecumenical Studies in Worship, 12) London: Lutterworth Press, 1963.

HODGSON, Leonard. "Theological Objections to the Ordination of Women," *Expository Times*, LXXVII (April 1966).

The Holy Eucharist: A Revision of Prayer Book Studies IV and XVII. The Standing Liturgical Commission of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. (Prayer Book Studies, 21) New York: Church Hymnal Corp., 1970.

HOON, Paul W. *The Integrity of Worship*. Ecumenical and Pastoral Studies in Liturgical Theology. New York: Abingdon Press, 1972.

HUNTINGTON, W. R. *A Short History of the Book of Common Prayer*. New York: Whittaker, 1893.

The Hymnal. Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. New York: Church Pension Fund, 1940.

JEREMIAS, Joachim. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.

JUNGMANN, Joseph A. *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development*. 2 vols. New York: Benziger Bros., 1951-55.

KÄSEMAN, Ernst. "Apocalypticism." *Journal of Theology and Church*, VI (1969).

_____. *The Testimony of Jesus*. London: SCM Press, 1968.

_____. *New Testament Questions of Today*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969.

KLAUSER, Theodor. *A Short History of the Western Worship*. London: Oxford University Press, 1969.

KOENKER, E. B. *The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church*. St. Louis: University of Chicago Press, 1966.

KÜNG, H. *The Living Church*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1963.

The Lambeth Conference 1958. London: S.P.C.K., 1958.

LA POTTERIE, Ignace de. *The Christian Lives by the Spirit*. Staten Island: Alba House, 1970.

LEITH, John H. *Creeds of the Churches*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1963.

The Liturgy of the Lord's Supper. A Revision of Prayer Book Studies IV. The Standing Liturgical Commission of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. (Prayer Book Studies, 17) New York: Church Pension Fund, 1966.

MACLEOD, Donald. *Presbyterian Worship: Its Meaning and Method*. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1965.

MACQUARRIE, John. "Some Comments on the Trial Liturgy." *American Church Quarterly*, VI:2 (1969), 75-83.

MAXWELL, W. D. *An Outline of Christian Worship*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1958.

MAYNARD, Farnham E. *The Continuity of the Church of England*. Melbourne: Fraser & Morphat Pty., 1939.

MCCORRY, Vincent P. *It is His Own Blood*. New York: America Press, 1962.

MILLER, John H. (ed.) *Yearbook of Liturgical Studies*. South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1960.

MOULE, Charles F. D. *Worship in the New Testament*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1961.

MULLER, Karl Ferdinand. "Living Worship." *Studia Liturgica*, VII:2-3 (1970).

NIEBUHR, Reinhold. *The Weakness of Common Worship in American Protestantism. Essays in Applied Christianity*. New York: Meridian, 1960.

O'BRIEN, David J. *The Renewal of American Catholicism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1972.

PANIKKAR, Raymundo. "Secularization and Worship." *Studia Liturgica*, VII:1 (1970), 40.

PORTER, H. Boone, Jr. *Growth and Life in the Local Church*. New York: Seabury Press, 1968.

POWELL, Mills Dawley. *The Episcopal Church and Its Work*. Greenwich, Conn.: Seabury Press, 1955.

PROTESTANT Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. General Convention. *Constitution and Canons, 1789-1970*.

RAHNER, Karl, and Angelus Häussing. *The Celebration of the Eucharist*. New York: Herder & Herder, 1968.

RAHNER, Karl. *Theology for Renewal*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1964.

REED, Luther D. *The Lutheran Liturgy. A Study of the Common Liturgy of the Lutheran Church in America*. Rev. Ed. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1947.

RICHARDSON, Alan. *An Introduction to the Theology of New Testament*. New York: Harper & Row, 1958.

ROBINSON, John A. T. *Liturgy Coming to Life*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960.

SANDERS, J. N., and E. A. Mastein. *A Commentary on the Gospel According to John*. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.

SCHLINK, Edmund. *The Coming Christ and the Coming Church*. London: Oliver & Boyd, 1967.

SCHMIDT, Herman. "Language and Its Function in Christian Worship." *Studia Liturgica*, VIII:1 (1971-72).

SCHMIDT, S. *Liturgy: Self-expression of the Church*. New York: Herder & Herder, 1972.

SCHUMANN, Alexander. *The World as Sacrament*. New York: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1968.

SCHURMANN, Heinz. *Traditions geschichtliche: Untersuchungen zu den Synoptischen Evangelien*. Dusseldorf: Patmos, 1968.

Services for Trial Use. Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A., 1971.

SHEPHERD, Massey H., Jr. *At all Times and In all Places*. Greenwich, Conn.: Seabury Press, 1953.

_____. *The Oxford American Prayer Book Commentary*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1950.

_____. *The Reform of Liturgical Worship*. New York: Seabury Press, 1960.

_____. *The Worship of the Church*. New York: Seabury Press, 1952.

SKOGLUND, J. *A Manual of Worship*. Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1968.

SOUTHCOTT, E. W. *The Parish Comes Alive*. London: Mowbray, 1966.

SPENCER, Bonnell. *Sacrifice of Thanksgiving*. West Park, N.Y.: Holy Cross, 1965.

STENDAHL, K. *The Bible and the Role of Women*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.

STEVÍK, Daniel B. *Language in Worship*. New York: Seabury Press, 1970.

SUTER, John Wallace. *The American Book of Common Prayer: Its Origin and Development*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1949.

SYKES, N., and Edmund Gibson. *A Study in Politics and Religion in the Eighteenth Century*. London: Oxford University Press, 1926.

TAYLOR, John. *The Rule and Exercise of Holy Dying*. 1651.

TAYLOR, Michael J. *The Protestant Liturgical Movement. A Catholic Viewpoint*. Westminster: Newman Press, 1963.

TAYLOR, V. *The Gospel According to St. Mark.* London: Macmillan, 1953.

Theology in the Age of Renewal. (Concilium, 17) Glen Rock: Paulist Press, 1970.

THRALL, Margaret E. *The Ordination of Women to the Priesthood: A Study of the Biblical Evidence.* London: SCM Press, 1958.

THOMPSON, Bard (ed.) *Liturgies of the Western Church.* Cleveland: Meridian, 1962.

The Time is Now. Anglican Consultative Council, First Meeting. London: 1971.

VANHENGEL, O. P. *Liturgy: the Crisis of Liturgical Reform.* New York: Paulist Press, 1969.

WEBER, Sarah Appleton. *Theology and Poetry in the Middle English Lyric.* A Study of Sacred History and Aesthetic Form. New York: Ohio State University Press, 1969.

WENTWORTH, Harold (comp.) *Dictionary of American Slang.* New York: Crowell, 1967.

WHITE, James F. *The Worldliness of Worship.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.

WIED, Hermann von. Consultatie, 1543. LUTHER, Martin. *Deutsche Messe,* 1526.

WIGAN, Bernard J. *The Liturgy in English.* 2d ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964.

WILSON, Thomas. *Principles and Duties of Christianity.* (Projected 1699, first printed 1707) The Manx Catechism was the first book printed in Manx.

WINWARD, Stephen F. *The Reformation of our Worship.* London: Kingsgate Press, 1964.

GLOSSARY

Absolution: A formal act of pronouncing the forgiveness of sins by a clergyman.

Agnes Dei: The verse 'O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us.' It was in the 1549 Book of Common Prayer, but omitted in the 1552 Prayer Book.

Alleluia: A Hebrew word meaning 'Praise the Lord.' Under the influence of the synagogue liturgy and Revelation 19:6, it was adopted into the Christian liturgy. In the Western liturgies, together with a verse from Scripture, it follows the gradual immediately preceding the Gospel. Its use is considered particularly appropriate to the Season of Easter.

Anamnesis: A Greek word (I Corinthians 11:24) usually translated "remembrance," but more properly to be rendered "re-calling," i.e., the re-calling of past events so that they become operative in the present by their effects. The term refers to the prayer in the liturgy that recalls the saving acts of Christ.

Anaphora: A Greek word meaning a "lifting up" or "offering" (Hebrews 7:27). It is the Prayer of Consecration.

Athanasian Canticle (Creed): It is a profession of faith widely used in Western Christiandom, and also known from its opening words as the "Quicunque Vult." It differs from the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds in form as well as in embodying anathemas.

Benedicite: Part of the Song of the Three Holy Children which is a Greek additional to Daniel 3, printed in the Old Testament Apocrypha. In the Prayer Book it is an alternative to the Te Deum, at Morning Prayer.

Benedictus: The Song of Zachariah (Luke 1:68-79). In the Book of Common Prayer, it is appointed after the New Testament Lesson.

Bidding Prayer: An invitation to pray. In the 1928 American Book of Common Prayer, a rubric before the Sermon reads: "Here, or immediately after the Creed, may be said the Bidding Prayer, or other authorized prayers and intercessions."

Blessing: An authoritative declaration of divine favour addressed to persons.

Canticle: Derived from the Latin diminutive *canticulum*, a little song, a canticle is a song from the Bible, other than from the Book of Psalms. The four canticles most in use in worship are the Benedictus, the Benedicite, the Nunc Dimittis and the Magnificat. The title is also used of the Te Deum.

Catechumens: Candidates for baptism.

Church Militant Prayer: This prayer in the Book of Common Prayer corresponds to the intercessions in the classical liturgies.

Collect: A short prayer. Its name is of Gallican origin and conveys the idea of gathering together the petitions of the people.

Communion: The partaking of the consecrated elements at the eucharist.

Confession: It is an acknowledgment of sin made in general written terms by a congregation in the course of liturgical worship.

Consecration Prayer: The central prayer in the Book of Common Prayer eucharistic liturgy, corresponding to the Roman Catholic Canon and the Eastern Orthodox Anaphora.

Creed: In the earliest Christian church, candidates for baptism were required to confess their personal belief (I believe) in the presence of the congregation. The earliest confessions of belief were short and simple: e.g., 'Jesus is Lord' (I Cor. 12:3), or 'I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God' (Acts 8:37). Eventually such simple baptismal creeds developed into the confession which we know as the Apostles' Creed. Later, another kind of creed, the Conciliar Creed (we believe) was promulgated with the authority of a council; its purpose was to define the true faith as over against the teaching of heretics. The Nicene Creed (now usually regarded as a product of the Council of Constantinople in 381 A.D., but expressing the faith of the preceding Council of Nicea in 325) is the most important and best known of the conciliar creed of the patristic age and today's liturgical movements.

Dead, Prayers for the: The practice of offering prayers on behalf of the dead is closely connected with the doctrine of Purgatory.

The warrant for it is the belief that those in purgatory are still part of the church and, as members of the Mystical Body of Christ who have not yet arrived at the beatific Vision, can be helped by the intercessions of those still alive.

In the Church of England express prayers for the dead have been absent from the Book of Common Prayer since 1552. In somewhat veiled form, prayers for the Dead were inserted in the 1928 American Book of Common Prayer.

Diptychs: A list of names of either the living or the dead, so-called from the two-leaved folder (Greek, diptuchon) in which the list was enclosed. It is however somewhat inaccurate to speak of diptychs in the Western liturgies where the custom was rather the 'naming' of the offerers at the offertory.

Dismissal: A sending forth at the conclusion of an act of worship.

Epiclesis: An invocation either of God that He will send the Holy Spirit, or of the Spirit directly, included in many eucharistic liturgies.

Evening Prayer or Evensong: The evening office of the Church of England (and all Anglican Churches) devised according to the same principles and with the same structure as Morning Prayer.

Filioque: It is Latin 'And the Son.' This dogmatic formula expressing the Double Procession of the Holy Ghost, added by the Western Church to the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed immediately

after the words "the Holy Ghost who proceeded from the Father." It is not part of the original Creed.

Fraction: The Breaking of the eucharistic bread for distribution.

Free and Candid Disquisitions: It is another term applied in the 17th century to the outlook of a group of Anglican (Episcopal) divines who, while continuing to conform with the Church of England, attached relatively little importance to matters of dogmatic truth, ecclesiastical organization and liturgical practice.

Gloria: Gloria in excelsis is an ancient Greek hymn, dating from at least the 4th century A.D., of which the opening sentence-- 'Glory be to God on high etc.'--has been taken from the angels' song in Luke 2:14. Its traditional position after the Kyrie was retained by the 1549 Book of Common Prayer and also in 1971 *Services for Trial Use* proposal.

Gradual: It was customary from the earliest days of the church to sing Psalms between the Biblical lections at the eucharist. The gradual was sung between the Old Testament lesson and the epistle, being so-called because the singer did not ascend to the top of the ambo, which was reserved for the Gospel, but stood on one of the steps (gradus). The gradual was omitted from the 1549 Book of Common Prayer and has not been restored in subsequent revisions, except that the American Book of

Common Prayer prescribes a hymn or anthem after the epistle.

Humble Access, Prayer of: It is a prayer of humble access to the Holy Communion.

I.C.E.T.: It stands for 'The International Consultation on English

Texts.' This consists of members drawn from the official liturgical or worship commissions of the following churches:

1. The Roman Catholic Church--members of the Advisory Committee of its International Committee on English in the Liturgy, including representatives from England, Ireland, the United States and Australia.
2. The Anglican Churches--representatives of the liturgical commissions of the Church of England, the Episcopal Church of Scotland, the Church of Ireland, the Church of Wales, and the Episcopal Church in the United States.
3. The Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship, which comprises members of the Lutheran Church of America, the American Lutheran Church, and the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod.
4. The (Presbyterian) Church of Scotland; and the English Methodist, Presbyterian, Congregational, and Baptist Churches.

Several churches of the English-speaking world are invited to use these texts on an experimental basis in the new liturgies which many of them are preparing.

Intercession: Prayer on behalf of others. Such prayer has always been offered by Christians (I Timothy 2:1ff.).

(the) *Introduction*: The liturgy begins with a corporate act of preparation. As a preliminary to the Service itself, a hymn may be sung or the service begins with a greeting of the clergy and the congregation.

Introit: An entrance song which was probably introduced into the eucharist in the West by Caelestine I (422-32). Initially it appears to have been a complete psalm, but, by the 12th century, only a single verse, proper to the day, was sung, with antiphon and Gloria. The 1549 Book of Common Prayer provided a whole psalm, but this was omitted in subsequent revisions.

Invitation: It is a calling for the people present in the liturgy to acknowledge their sins.

Kyrie: Kyrie Eleison (Greek, 'Lord have mercy') is an invocation. The first definite evidence of its use as the response to the petitions of a litany comes from fourth-century Jerusalem and Antioch, whence both the litany form itself and this response rapidly spread to all parts of the Christian world.

In the 1549 Book of Common Prayer the ninefold Kyrie appears in an English translation, but in the 1552 Book of Common Prayer it became the response to the Decalogue. In the 1928 Book of Common Prayer according to the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America its use is permitted. It has also been retained in the 1971 *Services for*

Trial Use proposal.

Lector: A reader.

Lesson: A portion of scripture read during worship. Seldom however, applied to the readings at the eucharist except when an Old Testament passage replaces the epistle. A distinction is often drawn between the "first lesson" from the Old Testament and "second" from the New.

Litany: A form of prayer consisting of petitions, or biddings with a fixed congregational response, so-called from the Greek word meaning 'supplication.'

Magnificat: The song attributed in nearly all manuscripts to Mary and by certain patristic writers to Elizabeth (Luke 1:46-55), so-called from the opening words in the Vulgate or Latin

Text: Magnificat anima mea Dominum, My Soul doth magnify the Lord.

Memorial: Serving to preserve remembrance.

(the) Ministry of the Word: The ministry of the word begins with the bringing of the Bible to the lectern, to be read, expounded and to be proclaimed.

Morning Prayer, Office: The Morning Office of the Church of England, called Mattins in the 1549 Book of Common Prayer. It consists of a free rendering and revision of the Latin hour services to

the previously existing system and to recover the orderly and continuous reading of the Bible and the recitation of the Psalms. Its structure:

1. Introduction, first provided in 1552 Book of Common Prayer
2. The Lord's Prayer and versicles
3. Venite
4. Psalms
5. Two lessons, each with its own canticle
6. Apostles' Creed
7. Lord's Prayer and suffrages
8. Three collects
9. Concluding prayers, added in 1662 Prayer Book.

Nonjurors Rite: This originated from the members of the Church of England who after 1688 scrupled to take the Oath of Allegiance to William and Mary on the grounds that by so doing they would break their previous oath to James II and his successors.

The Nonjurors were divided on the question of the lawfulness of worshipping in the parish church; the majority preferred their own rites (liturgies) which, of course, were illegal.

Nunc Dimittis: The Song of Simeon (Luke 2:29-32).

Oblations: Offerings or gifts presented at the eucharist. In the Book of Common Prayer the "oblations" in the prayer for the Church originally referred to money to be used for purposes other than the relief of the poor. Also the term refers to

the bread and wine.

Offertory: It was a movement of the congregation into the chancel to place the alms in the box and to remain there for communion. This was required by the 1549 Book of Common Prayer, but it was omitted in 1552. In an endeavor to encourage greater congregational participation in worship there is in the 1971 proposal a strong suggestion to have offertory processions, the frequent practice being for representatives of the people to carry up bread, wine, water and alms at the offertory.

Penitential Order: It is the acknowledgment of sin which may be either private and individual or public and corporate.

Preface, Sarum Proper: The term originally referred to any prayer solemnly pronounced by the president before the congregation as an accompaniment to a liturgical action; it is now confined to the introduction to the eucharistic prayer that begins with the *Sursum Corda* and ends with the *Sanctus*. The 1662 Book of Common Prayer provides proper prefaces for Christmas, Easter, Ascension, Whitsunday and Trinity, but later revisions (1928, 1953, 1967, and 1971) add more.

Priest: The term 'priest' is etymologically a contraction of 'presbyter.' The tendency of medieval theology to see the priesthood of the clergy almost exclusively in relation to the Mass led to its rejection by the Reformers. The term priest was (still

is) retained in the Book of Common Prayer apparently in order to make it clear that deacons were not to celebrate the Holy Communion.

Salutation: A greeting given by the clergy to the congregation. The dialogue introductory to the eucharistic prayer usually opens with such a salutation, e.g., II Corinthians 13:14, or 'The Lord be with you,' with the response, 'And with thy Spirit.'

Sanctus: The continuation of the preface at the eucharist, being a hymn of adoration based upon Isaiah 6:3, and Revelation 4:8. From the 4th century A.D., it was a normal feature of all liturgies.

Sarum Rite: The medieval liturgical use of Salisbury.

Sequence: In the 8th century, it became customary to prolong the final syllable of the Alleluia, tune being piled upon tune; these were known as sequentiae. As it was difficult to remember these complicated melodies, words were provided and formed into texts on the principle of one note to a syllable. This text was then itself called a sequence and also, being in prose rather than metrical form, a prose.

Subtitles: Secondary titles or divisions of the Liturgy.

Suffrages: Intercessory petitions of the kind used in a litany. Also it is a set of versicles and responses.

Sursum Corda: A Latin phrase meaning 'Lift up your heart.' From at least the 2nd century, this has formed part of the dialogue introductory to the eucharistic prayer.

Synaxis: A gathering together for worship and in particular for the first part of the eucharist i.e., for the Mass of the catechumens.

Te Deum: A Latin hymn of praise, so-called from its opening words-- Te Deum Laudamus, Thee, O God, we praise. Its use is primarily Western and is mainly confined to the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Churches.

Tract: The name given to the psalm sung after the epistle and gradual instead of the Alleluia during Lent and other penitential seasons. Unlike the gradual, tract frequently consists of many verses, e.g., the tract for Palm Sunday embraces most of Psalm 22 and that for Lent I the whole of Psalm 91.

Trisagion: The hymn--"Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy upon us," repeated three times--inserted in the Constantinopolitan liturgy 430-50 and also it has been in the American Episcopal liturgies (1953, 1967, and 1971).

Venite: Psalm 95 used at Mattins (Morning Prayer) whence it was incorporated by Cranmer into the Office of Morning Prayer, a substitute being provided for Easter Day. It was abbreviated in the 1928 Prayer Book.

Versicle: One of a series of short sentences, said or sung antiphonally; particularly one said by the minister and followed by a response from the congregation.

333 861
THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, C.